

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

MARCH, 1903.

NO. 9.

The Industrial Development of the South.*

IN a late issue of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW you have probably noticed the article by Geo. W. Rives, "A Short Cut." In this article the idea is put forth that we are much too slow in approaching the time of realization of the co-operative society, and that concentration of Socialist energy, propaganda and even money upon some limited territory might accelerate the advent of Socialism in that particular territory. The very fact that the editor of this monthly found it necessary to insert this article in order to refute the feasibility of this plan, is strong evidence how little the true philosophy of evolutionary Socialism has been assimilated in this country. Throw a stronger light upon this new plan of Mr. Rives', and you will not fail to recognize the old familiar face of pure utopian Socialism in it. Consider how closely it approaches the scheme of colonization of a western state with Socialists that so much was spoken and thought of in 1897. Whoever has made a careful study of scientific Socialism, knows that it proposes not a reform but a complete social revolution, a complete overthrow of modern society with all its forms of industrial organization—a change that, because of its magnitude, cannot be local, but must embrace pretty much the whole of our industrial society.

Whether a complete socialization of all the industrial countries of all the five continents will be necessary, we do not undertake to say. But one thing is certain: Take any one of the greater political units of the earth, like United States, Russia or Germany, and no matter how different the economic condition of different sections of the country, you cannot have Socialism in one part of the country and capitalism in the other. And yet we all agree that Socialism is an economic growth, and we all know what dif-

*A lecture delivered before the New York Russian Social Democratic Society, Dec. 21, 1902.

ferent stages of economic development may be found in the different sections of any one of the greater countries.

A small state like Belgium may move smoothly along the path of industrial life; a small state like Roumania may be all agricultural and backward. But compare the kingdom of Saxony with the province of Posen in Germany, or the district of Moscow, full of factories and mills, with the district of Tambov, where agriculture is all and industry next to nothing, and you will readily see that our European comrades have, or will have, difficulties to overcome, which very clearly resemble the difficulty of the Southern question. Look through the tables of the tremendous vote our party received this fall, and how is the showing of the South. In fact, so serious are those difficulties presented by the backwardness and stagnation of large divisions of the country, that to many they seemed to be insurmountable obstacles. To disprove this last view, at least in regard to the situation in our own country, to indicate the hopeful signs of a new industrial life in the stagnating South—to prove the existence of these favorable symptoms beyond the possibility of a shadow of a doubt—such are the purposes of this short sketch.

We shall not go into any historic philosophical speculations as to the causes of the great Civil War. It is certain, however, that an industrial revolution throughout the United States was the result. "With the Civil War there began a new industrial era not only on account of the expansion of mechanical industries . . . but on account of the wonderful change in the system of labor which prevailed in a large part of the country."* Wright speaks of the system of sale of free labor, a system which is not only wonderful but admirable from the capitalist point of view.

Let us draw a short pen picture of the life of the South before the Civil War. In its main features it is a feudal system. Population is divided into three main classes: (1) the slave owners, the white barons; (2) the slaves, and (3) the "white trash" who hang on to the rich slave owners. These lived on their estates, very much in the fashion of the Russian nobleman before the liberation of the serfs. The towns were markets, whither the rich planters went from time to time for purchases and a gay time. The rich slave-owning class cultivated the same virtues, which counted for so much among the mediaeval feudal barons. Up to this time the Southern gentleman imitates the knight of the fifteenth century in his manner towards ladies, and the ladies are as graceful and charming as the heroines of Walter Scott. The ideal of the new, free, independent woman does not as yet exist in the South.

Because of the peculiarities of the rich soil, the rich plantation

*Carroll D. Wright. *Industrial Evolution of the United States*. P. 173.

owners grew only a limited number of useful plants, and were therefore forced to carry on a large foreign trade. All their cotton or sugarcane went North or was exported. "The fashion of the South has been to consider the production of cotton and sugar and rice the only rational pursuits of gentlemen, except the professions, and, like the haughty Greek and Roman, to class the trading and manufacturing spirit as essentially servile," a Southern journalist wrote in 1852. The view that the condition of industry in the ancient world was caused by the contempt felt towards it, is extremely naive, of course. For the truth is just the reverse of it; the contempt was caused by its primitive condition. Yet the modern American writer, to whom we are obliged for this interesting quotation, substitutes for it another explanation which is not worth much more: "A more correct statement is that manufactures and commerce had been retarded in the South because one class, limited in number and representing only about one-fourth of the white population, has for various reasons preferred a plantation civilization to any other."* In short, there was no industry, because for many reasons there was none. But what were these many reasons? Development of manufacturing industry presupposes free labor power, which did not exist in the South at that period of its history. On the other hand, all the Southern capital that existed was naturally attracted towards slave-owning as a very profitable business.

The vast majority, then, of the natural products of the South supplied distant mills. Here and there some small industrial establishments sprang forth—mainly in the line of cotton industry, but they had to utilize negro labor, slave-labor, which did not seem at all to suit the requirements of industrial work. No capital came from the North, partly because of political reasons, partly because even the North did not possess at that time any surplus of capital, and partly because the main attraction for capital did not exist in the South, a plentiful supply of free labor. "Cheapness of cotton, abundance of water power, the resources of the coal fields, when steam began to supplant the dam, the other mineral resources, and the wealth of forests of pine, live oak, cypress and others, from other parts sufficient capital to develop the section to anything like its full extent" (p. 73).

Southern manufacture, therefore, consisted in this period mainly of production for the immediate, surrounding market for the satisfaction of the local demand. The first stage of cotton manufactures—cotton growing, was almost the only one considerable form of industry, that grew, because of the enormous economy of doing this work right at the place of the cotton plantation.

*Southern Sidelights. By Edward Ingie, A. B. N. Y., 1896. (Library of Economics and Politics, edited by R. T. Ely, M. D.)

Yet, notwithstanding all this, the South was a rich country, if we give this phrase its ordinary vulgar interpretation. In 1890, the editor of a Baltimore publication, the *Manufacturers' Record*, Mr. Edmonds, published a pamphlet, "The Redemption of the South from Poverty to Wealth," and he gave his work the following sub-title: "In 1860 the Richest Part of the Country. In 1870 the Poorest. In 1880 Signs of Improvement. In 1889 Regaining the Position of 1860." So you see that the South before the Civil War was not only a rich, but the richest country. But the catastrophe of 1861-65 shook the very foundation of this prosperity. The sudden transformation of millions of human beings, representing thousands of millions of property, into so many proletarians in the very worst sense of the term—people without property, and without visible means of support—this sudden transformation alone was sufficient to change the South from the richest into the poorest part of the Union. But even disregarding this sudden metamorphosis the Civil War could not but have a destructive influence upon the economic well-being of the South. The millions which the unequal struggle cost, destruction of buildings, neglect of farms and plantations, hundreds of thousands of workers lost—all this destroyed the prosperity of this once rich country for many years to come.

The first years of Reconstruction were, therefore, sad years indeed. Yet this sad condition of affairs could not last indefinitely. The South now had no organic obstacle to the development of capitalistic production. Besides the enormous supply of free negro labor, which was the direct result of emancipation, the impoverishment of the slave-holding magnates, and the still greater impoverishment of the white "trash," laid foundation to a white proletariat. The negro for many years remained fit for agricultural work only; this white proletariat however immediately formed excellent material for factory production. The natural resources of the South are in no respect poorer than those of the North. The rich soil, which is the best in the world for cultivation of cotton, tobacco, sugar cane, rice, etc., is in itself sufficient as a foundation for industrial activity. But the South has, in addition, coal mines and iron ore, and coal and iron have always been and are now the parents of all large industry. If these two conditions, a plentiful supply of free labor and natural resources, are all sufficient for a gradual development of capitalist industry, a flow of capital from outside is necessary for the quickening of the process, and such capital did not fail to appear.

Northern capital was destined to perform the same service for the South, which German, French and Belgian capital performs at present for Russia. It took a few decades before this influence could show itself. It's true, Edmonds, whom we have

already quoted, claimed that in 1889 the South has regained the position she held in 1860, that of the richest section of the country, but this of course is an enormous exaggeration. Even now the South is undoubtedly the poorest section of the United States. Northern capital began to appear in the South very gradually, indeed. Up to the '80s even the North did not possess any superfluous capital that could not be placed profitably in the immediate locality, and, besides, the naturally strained relations between the North and the South could not but be a freezing influence. Only in the second half of the '90s, when the phenomenal growth of Northern industries, the rise of profits because of the process of consolidation, and the rapid formation of enormous private capitals, caused in the North the rather unusual experience of free capital seeking profitable employment, when American capital began to migrate to the West Indies, the East Indies, the Orient, and even to England and the continent—when the Spanish-American war, with its sudden outburst of maudlin "patriotism," had "reconciliated" the North and South, then, I say, Northern capital had to go Southward. Soon other factors appeared, which directed to the South not only Northern capital, but also Northern industry. The South, it was said, began to compete with the North. In reality, however, Southern labor competed with Northern labor. Behind both stood the same Northern capitalist. Unfortunately there are no reliable statistics as to the extent of the migration of Northern capital and Northern enterprises towards the South, yet, as we will see later, at least in one industry, this process can be somewhat studied. This is the cotton industry.

Let us first look at the growth of Southern industry in its entirety. Whichever symptom of industrial growth we might take, we always come to the same conclusion, that the South is rapidly approaching the North, by exhibiting a higher co-efficient of growth. The distance between the North and South on the road of industrial development is enormous, but still more significant is the fact that this distance is rapidly becoming smaller.

Let us look at the growth of capital in manufacturing establishments, and we find the following data, always comparing the whole United States with the South:

	In million dollars.		Per cent of increase in ten years.	
	U. S.	South.	U. S.	South.
1870	2,118	139
1880	7,780	193	31.7	38.7
1890	6,525	510	13.39	164.7
1900	9,817	953	50.9	86.7

Compare the last two columns and you can read an eloquent story out of them, if you notice how much larger the per cent of increase is for the South than for the whole United States. Should we, instead of the United States, compare the South with the North, the results would undoubtedly be still more striking; but in the form in which we present them the statistical data are convincing enough, as they prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the Southern industrial capital is growing more rapidly than the Northern.

Within thirty years the capital in manufactures of the entire United States has increased by 363 per cent and the Southern manufacturing capital 585.6 per cent. Looking upon it in a somewhat different view now, we find that in 1870 the South's share of the manufacturing capital was 6.6 per cent, in 1890 6.9 per cent, in 1890 7.8 per cent, and in 1900 9.7 per cent.

Now we will take the value of products as the basis of our comparison, and we naturally arrive at the same results:

	In million dollars.		Per cent of increase by decades.	
	U. S.	South.	U. S.	South.
1870	4,232	279	...	22.0
1880	5,369	338	26.9	22.0
1890	9,372	706	74.5	108.6
1900	13,039	1,184	39.1	67.6

In thirty years the value of the products of manufactures of the United States increased by 208 per cent, and the value of products of the Southern manufactures 327.4 per cent. In 1870 the South's share was 6.6 per cent, in 1900 9.1 per cent.

And still more important are the data relative to the growth of wage-earners, as here we get a glimpse of information concerning the growth of the laboring class:

	In thousands.		Per cent of increase by decades.	
	U. S.	South.	U. S.	South.
1870	2,054	186
1880	2,783	223	33.0	19.8
1890	4,257	412	56.6	84.4
1900	5,321	656	25.2	59.8

Within thirty years the number of workingmen in manufacturing industries of the United States increased 157.5 per cent, but in the South the number of workingmen increased 252.7 per cent. In 1870, therefore, 9.1 per cent of the workingmen were in the South, and in 1900 12.3 per cent!

Within these thirty years the population of the United States increased from 38.5 millions to 76.3 millions, or almost 100 per cent,

and the population of the Southern States from 124 millions to 252, or 105 per cent. The number of wage-earners in the manufacturing industries only was, in 1870, 5.3 per cent of the whole population of the United States; in the South however it amounted only to 1.5 per cent. In 1900 the workers in manufactures constituted 7 per cent of the population, and in the South 2.5 per cent. Let us call the proportion of workers in manufactures to the population of the United States 100, then the competitive proportion in the South would be equal to 28.3 in 1870 and 35.7 in 1900. Such is the mathematical expression of the industrial growth of the South.

When we turn to the growth of the number of manufacturing establishments, however, the most natural indicator of the growth of industry where industrial life is in its beginning, we find the following: In the United States the number of manufacturing establishments increased 44.3 per cent in the last twenty years, and in the Southern States by 81.4 per cent.

While in the entire United States the average capital per establishment increased from \$18,300 in 1890 to \$19,200; and in New England it increased from \$243.20 to \$275.10; in the Middle States it increased from \$204.00 to \$246.40; in the Southern States, on the contrary, it was \$110.00 in 1890, and \$113.20 in 1900, i. e., remained almost the same. This was to be expected. Where capitalistic production is in its primary stages, where capital is scanty, labor cheap and the rate of profits and interests high, there even to the smallest capitalist a large field of activity is open. Yet even here we see the advantages of the young, industrial region, which evidently can live through all the necessary stages in a much shorter time, for the South is already acquainted, and to an appreciable extent with the phenomena of industrial consolidation and concentration. We need but mention the whisky trust, the tobacco trust, and the creation of the last weeks, the consolidation of the Southern cotton factories.

Though we wish to refrain from details concerning separate industries, yet we think it absolutely necessary to say a few words about the development of the cotton industry in the South, for here we find an eloquent illustration of the relations between the Northern and Southern industry, and of the role the South is destined to play in the future economic development of the United States. For the last thirty years the cotton industry grew, by decades, in the following manner:*

	1870-1880.	1880-1890.	1890-1900.
United States . . .	5.8 per cent.	28.9 per cent.	7.8 per cent.
New England . . .	14.7 per cent.	26.3 per cent.	5.8 per cent.
South	43.8 per cent.	153.8 per cent.	128.8 per cent.

*Twelfth Census, Vol. VII., p. CLXXVII.

Compare but the last two lines and you have the whole story of the development of the cotton industry in a nutshell.

In 1890 the South had 239 factories, with a capital of 53 millions, 36,000 workmen and a value of products that amounted to 41.5 millions. In 1900, 401 factories, capital 124 millions, number of workmen 97,500, and value of products 95 million dollars. It is positively known that several factories have preferred to move to the South because of the, there, more profitable conditions of production. Northern capital was more mobile than Northern factories, and moved thither more freely. Our esteemed Mayor, Seth Low, is not the only one to derive his means to do charity in the North from the Southern cotton factories.

What is so plain and evident in regard to manufacture of cotton goods, is, or will be, true of other goods as well, as, for instance, of tobacco manufacture. In the very near future we can expect a veritable exodus to the South of various factories and mills, which will find the Southern atmosphere, notwithstanding its heat and yellow fever, more congenial to them. What are the advantages of the South?

The most powerful arguments in support of his theories the Socialist often borrows from the capitalist writers. A few years ago that extremely capitalist paper, the *Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin*, sent its special representative to the Southern States to investigate the question of the South's advantages for the manufacture of cotton goods. In one of his letters this special envoy of capitalism writes that "a special committee of the Arkwright Club of Boston visited the South in 1897 and, after investigation of the textile industry there, presented a report setting forth the advantages which it considered the South had over the North in the manufacture of cotton goods. These advantages were, it declared, so great as to make competition on the part of New England a losing business. It grouped them chiefly under four heads, as follows:

"I. That cotton is conveniently near to the Southern mills and freight on it can be saved.

II. That water power is abundant and that coal is cheap if you prefer to run by steam.

III. That labor is abundant and cheap and not inclined to organize against employers; and

IV. That the enactment of labor laws is not likely to trouble employers for many years."

The correspondent goes on to examine critically these four claims. As to savings on freight, because of the raw material being near, he finds that this advantage has been greatly overestimated. Cotton growing is spreading westward now, and

Texas is the main supply. Cotton manufacturing in the South is concentrating in the Southeast, in South and North Carolina, where new factories are built, though the production of raw cotton has reached its limits. Besides, what Southern mills gain in freight or raw material is largely offset by the cost of getting their manufactured goods to the market. As to water power, modern manufacturers give it up in favor of steam power. However, he acknowledges that "wages are lower, hours of labor longer." And though he sees the coming danger of labor movements, unions and labor legislation, yet he says "it must at least be many years before it (Southern labor) loses its present distinctive and admirable characteristics." Admirable, indeed. We shall learn a little more of these characteristics presently. Meanwhile we will quote a little table, which the correspondent has made up as a result of his personal observations, in regard to the wages in the Southern cotton mills. The following munificent salaries are paid per day to the "free and independent" adult male workers:

	North Carolina.	South Carolina.	Georgia.	Alabama.
Carders' pay	\$0.95	\$0.90	\$0.95	\$0.80
Speeders' pay77	.80	.92	.83
Spoolers' pay77	.80	.90	.65
Spinners' pay68	.63	.80	.58
Weavers' pay90	.95	1.05	.95

This, remember is for eleven and often for twelve and even thirteen hours of work.

In another of his letters the same correspondent speaks of the first efforts of introducing negro labor into the textile factories. Here we touch upon an exceedingly interesting feature of the economic development of the South for the last years. The negro, who, for generations was considered capable of agricultural labor only, is being transformed into a factory workman. The Socialist can only rejoice at this, for here we find a tendency, whose ultimate work will be a final solution of the negro question. As it often happens, our enemy, the capitalist, is here our main ally. Only consider what will happen to the South, when the negro will prove fit not only for textile but for all other factories, and as a necessary corollary will prove susceptible to labor union and Socialist propaganda.

Meanwhile, however, negro labor will attract the capitalist not only by its cheapness, but also by its submission to the extreme degrees of exploitation. The following conversation between our correspondent and a certain Mr. Thurston, superintendent of a silk mill owned by Ashley & Bailey Company (a

firm, by the way, that has silk mills at Paterson, N. J., and in Pennsylvania, and can therefore very well judge of the difference of Southern and Northern profits) at Fayetteville, N. C., certainly deserves to be immortalized. Mr. Thurston, the correspondent says, puts his views in the following form:

"It is a mistake to believe that the negro has not enough manual dexterity to make him a successful worker in the textile field. All our help here has been trained from the start and within a year we have made as good an average of capable workers as if we had been training white help. But no one will make a success of a mill by applying white methods to the colored people, with the latter there is but one rule to follow, that of the strictest discipline. Call it military despotism, if you will. There are no indulgences in this mill; kindness would be construed as weakness and advantage taken of it to the detriment of our work. Faults and irregularities are severely punished."

"By fines, I suppose," the correspondent suggested.

"No, sir, by whipping."

"But doesn't that only apply to the smaller boys?"

"No, it applies to the larger ones, too."

"Do you whip the girls?"

"Yes, the girls are whipped, too; but one whipping is generally enough for the bigger girls; they are so much ashamed that a second whipping is seldom needed."

"By whipping do you mean a light chastisement?"

"The punishment is not light, it is severe; anything else would be a waste of time. It is upon this system that we have to rely to secure a proper performance of duty. All the help engaged here under twenty-one years of age are put absolutely under my control from 6 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock at night, and I am free from responsibility as to the course I pursue towards them during that time."

Admirable, isn't it?

You must notice, that here we have been in the silk industry. The cotton industry is not the only one which pays better in the South than in the North. It is not a specific but a very general phenomenon with which we are now dealing. I hope you will excuse me for introducing here a few more statistical data which will demonstrate the comparative cheapness of Southern labor power:

	1890.	1900.
Entire United States	\$498.71	\$490.90
New England	509.33	507.12

*Twelfth Census, Vol. VII., p. CX V., etc.

	1890.	1900.
Middle States	540.62	528.71
Central States	470.84	488.51
Western States	565.91	577.09
Pacific States	620.39	577.11
Southern States	364.83	334.96

Not only are the wages the very lowest in the South, but they have fallen within the last ten years, and fallen more than in many other sections. In some States the yearly earnings are still lower, as for instance in Alabama \$309.10, in Georgia, \$264.24, in North Carolina \$235.20, and in South Carolina \$232.08, or a little more than \$4.50 a week. The female worker in the South has a still more precarious existence:

	1890.	1900.
Entire United States	\$267.97	\$273.03
New England	293.43	307.34
Middle States	273.19	280.75
Central States	237.42	249.45
Western States	267.78	273.48
Pacific States	288.61	278.09
Southern States	193.03	183.91

The average earnings of the Southern woman wage-worker have fallen, notwithstanding the general rise in the wages of women. While the man's earnings in the South represent 68.2 per cent of the average earnings of a worker throughout the United States in 1900, the Southern women's yearly earnings equal only 67.3 per cent. In Alabama the average earnings fall to \$180.63, in South Carolina to \$172.80, in Virginia to \$161.02, and in North Carolina to 153.06, just \$3 a week.

Children's labor is paid at a correspondingly low rate:

	1890.	1900.
The entire United States	\$137.53	\$152.22
New England	158.07	187.15
Middle States	146.22	159.52
Central States	138.61	166.21
Western States	116.99	175.07
Pacific States	169.30	181.62
Southern States	99.34	107.20

These earnings fall to \$101.57 in Alabama, \$99.23 in South Carolina, and \$96.01 in North Carolina. Yet the wages of children rose somewhat, even in the South, because of the enormous increase in the demand for it.

Yes, the Southern factory asks for child's labor, looks for it,

and is even willing to increase the pay for it somewhat; for how easy it is to exploit the poor mites to the very last degree of human endurance.

Child labor is one of the most characteristic features of the early stages of capitalistic development, and we are therefore prepared to find it in the South developed to a high degree. However unreliable the statistical data in regard to this question, they are nevertheless very eloquent. In the entire United States there were in 1900 in the manufactures, 168,583 children;* out of those 43,038 children, or 25.5 per cent, were in the South. The significance of this proportion will become clear, if we remember that out of the entire number of industrial workers only 12.9 per cent fell to the share of the South, which, therefore, has proportionately twice as many children in factories as the rest of the country. In the United States children constituted 3.2 per cent of the number of workingmen; in the Southern States, however, 6.6 per cent. In the Central States, with their highly developed manufactures, only 2.3 per cent of the workingmen were children; in the Western States only 2.1 per cent, and in the Pacific States only 1.9 per cent. Still more significant is the fact that child labor is on the increase in the South, while in all the other sections of the country, with its much more advanced industries, child labor is gradually disappearing. If we take the period of twenty years, from 1880 to 1900, the number of children under 16 years employed in New England diminished from 41,306 to 25,187; in the Middle States diminished from 79,118 to 61,225; in the Central States diminished from 39,115 to 33,974; in the Southern States increased from 19,639 to 43,038.

As the general industrial progress has as yet invaded only certain of the Southern States, so this phase of it—child labor—has become a great deal more prominent in some States than in others, namely, in Alabama, Georgia, in North and South Carolina.

Number of children in manufactures.

	1880.	1890.	1900.
Alabama	809	1,425	3,474
Georgia	2,319	3,521	6,373
North Carolina	2,352	4,733	10,377
South Carolina	1,118	2,309	8,560

Children constituted in 1900 6.5 per cent of all industrial workingmen in Alabama, 7.6 per cent in Georgia, 14.7 per cent in North Carolina, and 17.7 per cent in South Carolina! These dry statistical tables do not, however, give an adequate idea of the serious condition of affairs. We must keep in mind the fact that

*Census Reports, Vol. VII., p. CXXVIII.

these statistical data are far from being accurate; this information was obtained through agents from owners of factories, who certainly made an effort to minimize the sadness of the picture, even granting the (questionable) willingness to be as conscientious and truthful as possible, the broad limits of classification made mistakes inevitable, and mistakes in one direction—that of counting children among the adults. And for this reason, according to the census regulation, only workmen below 16 are counted as children; and where factories are crowded with tots 10, 9, and even 8 and 7 years old, there a 15-year-old lad or girl will very often be considered a grown-up person. These qualifications are not invented by us; they are put forth by the official census statistician (Vol. VII., p. cxxv.).

A short time ago the "great, fair-minded American press" has turned its "searchlight" upon this evil; but, we must not forget, it took a small labor paper to start the ball rolling, to point out to the Northern press what was going on in the Southern factories. With the articles of Mrs. Irene Ashley-Macfayden, in *The American Federationist*, the reader is undoubtedly familiar, and I need not tire him with lengthy quotations from it; you all remember "the little boy, in Alabama, who worked for forty nights in succession," and "another child 6 years old, who had been on the night shift eleven months, the description of the accidents and diseases that befell the little industrial slaves.

As you well know, the Southern cotton factories are the main employers of child labor. But few of you imagine to what an extent this labor is used. Here again a few statistical data may prove convincing, if not interesting. In 1870 there were 2,343 children in the Southern cotton factories; in 1880, 4,098; in 1890, 8,815; in 1900, 24,459, out of a total number of 97,559 workmen, or more than 25 per cent. During these thirty years the number of children in the cotton factories of New England diminished from 14.5 per cent to 6.7 per cent, in the Middle States from 22.0 per cent to 12.0 per cent, in the Western States from 31.1 per cent to 9.0 per cent. In the South more than one-fourth of all workers in cotton factories are children, in South Carolina the proportion rises to 26.8 per cent, and in Alabama to 29.2 per cent. There you have at least one powerful cause of the migration of the cotton factories into the Southern States. And what are the conditions of life and work for these little victims? Mrs. Macfayden's statements may be prejudiced, you know, for she writes for a labor paper. Let us turn to the highly respectable bourgeois publication, *The Dry Goods Economist*, which had a special representative make a thorough investigation of this matter. The result of this investigation was summed up as follows:

"First, that one tenth to one-fifth of the total number of cotton operators are mere children.*

"Second, that they work from eleven to twelve hours a day.

"Third, that they are paid from 10 to 50 cents a day.

"Fourth, that boys and girls from 14 to 18 make from 50 to 75 cents a day.

"Fifth, that adults rarely make over a dollar a day, and that on piece work.

"Sixth, that the children's work, though not heavy, is grinding and nerve-racking.

"Seventh, that the constant buzz of whirring wheels, the high temperature, and vitiated air, conditions inseparable from cotton mills, wear down the stoutest frame and strongest nerves, and the children so employed ere long lose the bright eye, healthy glow, and elastic step which is the common heritage of youth.

"Eighth, that in many cases these urchins are held in hopeless bondage to their illiterate, heartless and avaricious parents.

"Ninth, that the normal order of things is, alas! too often inverted, and the saddening spectacle presented of weak children supporting able-bodied parents, in lieu of parents supporting their offspring.

"Tenth, that not one out of twenty of such toilers can read or write."

As was to be expected, of course, the bourgeois reporter makes an asinine effort (in his eighth and ninth statements) to throw the odium of child labor on heartless parents, but the effort is worthless in the eyes of any serious economist, and the effectiveness of the general statement not in the least impaired by it. Elbert Hubbard, that eloquent and original journalist, puts into powerful expressions what we all undoubtedly feel when he exclaims in "The Philistine:"

"I know the sweatshops of Hester street, New York. I am familiar with the vice, depravity and degradation of the White-chapel district; I have visited the Ghetto of Venice; I know the lot of coal miners of Pennsylvania, and I know somewhat of Siberian atrocities; but for misery, woe, and hopeless suffering, I have never seen anything to equal the cotton mill slavery of South Carolina—this is my own America, the land of the free and the home of the brave!"

And yet, * * * this condition of affairs has not even the virtue of originality. History repeats itself, of course. And while you read the above lines, haven't you all thought of the tenth chapter of the first volume of Marx's Capital, entitled "The Working Day?"

*We do not know what the writer means by "mere children," but we have shown above that not 1-10—1-5, but 1-4—1-3 of all cotton operatives are, according to the census, below 16 years of age.

One of the necessary conditions of such extensive and also intensive exploitation of little children in the factories of the South is to be found in the scantiness (we might say absence) of any bona fide labor legislation.

None of the States or Territories of our republic need be very proud of its labor legislation, that's true; still the condition of affairs in the South is infinitely worse than in the North. Let us look upon this one question of regulation of hours of labor. Out of forty-eight States and Territories twenty-one have absolutely no legal limitations of the working day, even of women and children. Out of those twenty-one, ten are Southern States. Out of the fifteen States that constitute the American South, as many as ten (North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Florida, West Virginia, Mississippi, Texas and Arkansas) allow full freedom of exploitation of women's and children's work. But the remaining five States are not in a much better position. In Louisiana sixty hours a week are the limits of work for women and children. The same law applies to Virginia, but here 14 years is defined as the limit of childhood. What a kind provision of legislation to limit the work of children under 14 to ten hours a day, Saturdays not excluded. In South Carolina and Georgia the legal working day for women and children is eleven hours a day, or 66 hours a week.

At what age may children be admitted to factory work? In New York the law puts the limit at 14, and though the execution of this law is by far not as strict as it might be, yet it undoubtedly exercises a beneficial influence. Altogether nine states put the limit at the same age. Yet in vain would you look for the name of any Southern State among these nine; 21 States have no limit at all, and among them are ten Southern States. The only limitations that exist in the South are as follows:

In Louisiana, 14 years for girls and 12 years for boys.

In West Virginia and Tennessee, 12 years for children of both sexes.

About fifteen States have different laws for the purpose, an obligatory school attendance for children working in factories; among them not a Southern State.

And how worthless even existing legislation is. Among sixteen States that have some kind of regular factory inspection, that have at least the office of factory inspector, there is only one Southern State—Tennessee—not one of the industrial States of the South. What good is it that the labor laws of Louisiana forbid factory work to girls under 14 years of age if there is nobody to watch that the law should be faithfully executed. Of course, there remains the possibility of a complaint through the regular channels. But whom would you expect to raise that com-

plaint? The parents against the factory owner? Or the factory owner against the parents? Or the 11-year-old girl against either of them?

When it comes to anti-labor legislation, however, the Southern legislative bodies all of a sudden awake and become quite active. Mississippi, Oklahoma, Kansas have anti-strike laws. Out of nine States with anti-boycott laws three belong to the South. How slow to defend the interests of labor, how quick to defend the interests of capital! This is true of all legislation in the United States, of course. All we wanted to indicate was how much worse legally the condition of the working man in the South than in the industrial North, East or Center.

Labor legislation is never granted as an act of charity by the benevolent legislators. It is compromise with the advance guard of the labor movement. Why, then, should there be any proper legislation where the labor movement is as weak as it is in the South. Yet the South is awakening, as a number of strikes during the last few years have shown. The following statistical data extracted from the tables in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor (Carrol D. Wright), on strikes and lock-outs are instructive. Commissioner Wright has collected statistics as to strikes in the United States for the last twenty years (July, 1881-June 30, 1901), comparing the data for the entire United States with the data for all the Southern States, we arrive at the following conclusions:

Of the entire number of strikes during this period	
the share of the South was	7.345 per cent
Of the entire number of establishments affected by	
strikes during this period the share of the South	
was	5.777 per cent
Of the entire number of striking workmen during	
this period, the share of the South was....	7.731 per cent
While of the entire number of workmen in manu-	
factures, the South's share is	12.3 per cent
And of the entire number of manufacturing estab-	
lishments, the South's share is	16.4 per cent

In other words, the South had a great deal less than its proper share of strikes, which is very significant.

A great many important points in the industrial development of the South are here left undiscussed, for I have tried to touch only upon the most salient questions. I particularly regret not having worked out the statistical data concerning agriculture, but this would carry me too far. Whether a process of concentration is as inevitable in agriculture as it is in manufactures, we are not prepared to say. In any case, we could not expect this process at

the present stage of the development of the South. We must not forget that after 1868 there inevitably began a process of disintegration of the large plantations, which were based on slave labor. Nevertheless a certain process of concentration of energy goes on in the South as well as in the North. For even in the South population is moving from country into the city, while the farming population increased but 18.3 per cent within the last ten years, population of towns with less than 4,000 each increased 52.8 per cent, and that of cities above 4,000 38.4 per cent.

In closing, let us ask ourselves, what are the conclusions and practical results of all these facts and figures? They are very simple, indeed, almost elementary. The following twelve assertions will probably be agreed to by every unprejudiced reader:

1. In the process of economic evolution, the South is considerably behind the North.

2. But within the last thirty years the South is rapidly approaching the North, by growing and developing at a faster rate.

3. The main stimulus towards this development was the formation of a plentiful supply of free labor, and the influence of this stimulus began to assert itself as soon as the South recovered from the shock of the war.

4. Northern capital became an important auxiliary force, which accelerated the process.

5. The force that attracted Northern capital to the South was the opportunity of more extensive exploitation of labor.

6. This extensive exploitation is possible because of weakness of trade unionism, absence of labor movement and of labor legislation.

7. These conditions of capitalistic productions in the South must inevitably assert their influence over the conditions of labor in the North.

8. Thorough organization of Southern labor is therefore necessary to Northern labor as a measure of self-defense.

9. Trade-union and Socialist agitation in the South is therefore the most urgent order of the day.

10. Notwithstanding the past failures, there is being formed in the South, through efforts of capitalism, a receptive soil for such propaganda.

11. Industrial capital transforms the negro into a modern proletarian and in this way prepares the way for the solution of the negro question.

12. The American South presents temporary difficulties, but no organic obstacle to the evolution of the country towards a co-operative society.

Dr. I. M. Rubinow.

The Economic Interpretation of History.

THE standpoint from which one approaches the study of society or history is of the first importance. All depends on the answer to the question as to the cause of social progress. What is the reason for great changes in human thought and human life? What is the underlying motive force in social action?

Until the middle of the last century little or no attention was given to the subject of causation in history. A mere record of political events, dynasties, and military campaigns makes up the contents of the early histories. The old conception of society viewed history as a series of biographies of the great men who had successively appeared and drawn society onward. This was the "One Man Theory."

From this viewpoint Martin Luther was reckoned as the one person who by force of character and strength of will, brought about the Reformation. It was never seen that for years the old forms of Feudalism had been giving way, and the trading Bourgeoisie rising into power, that a new individualism was coming into existence and that the religious change was only a small part of the great industrial economic change that was transforming all of society. Martin Luther was but the person whom conditions had produced and that the tide of events bore to the top and made its mouthpiece. He in himself had no power to stay or bring a Reformation. Years before other priests had said the same as Luther, but their words had no effect, for economic conditions were not ripe for change.

Again, Oliver Cromwell has been written of as the one individual who had the power to overthrow Charles I. and set a curb to the unrestrained power of monarchs. The conditions that made a Cromwell possible had been gathering for generations. He represented the bourgeois power, that was undermining the strength of the nobility. The struggle between Charles and Cromwell represented a conflict of great economic forces embodied in different economic classes.

Napoleon has filled pages of our histories. But Napoleon would have been no Napoleon if conditions had not worked together to make such a man possible. He was the product of the volcanic forces of the French Revolution. In France the trading class was growing in power. Napoleon simply stood for the interests of that class. He came in on the Revolutionary wave and because of the disorganized condition of France his domination was possible and natural.

Society, then, is not advanced to higher planes through the influence of individual great men. It is plain that great social changes arise from causes that strike roots deep down in the life of the mass of the people.

History written as it was, consisting only of a record of ruling dynasties, of kings, great men, battles and conquests, was a useless study. It must be a matter of the greatest surprise to a student of history, who has advanced beyond the point where he views it merely as an account of all these to note the slight reference to the industrial life of the people that historians content themselves with making. For instance, take the guilds, commercial and industrial, that played so prominent a part in civilized society for so many centuries, and yet it is but recently that any interest has been taken in the subject. In fact, we may say that industrial history itself has had its birth and development within the last half century.

Heretofore history had no continuity. It was conceived of as a series of isolated stages. There was no attempt to point out the growth of one stage from another. There was no effort to trace the thread of progress or the line of cause and effect that runs throughout society.

Not only did history lack continuity in time, but it was written by nations and had no connection geographically. We saw the rise and fall of kings in England and France, in Greece and Rome, in Egypt and Assyria, but that any of these exercised any influence on each other was utterly disregarded. No broad, continuous view of society was dreamed of. We pigeon-holed each country, and saw no relation of events.

A history of institutions was unknown and from the general view of things it was quite natural that all such institutions should be supposed to be eternal. The growth of present forms from earlier ones was inconceivable. To-day, under the influence of the theory of evolution, we have come to see that whether it be governments or industrial arts, whether it be customs or beliefs, we can no more understand their present forms without a study of their earlier forms than the chemist can understand the compound without reducing it to its elements.

Further there had not yet grown up that critical period in history that not only looked with critical eye on the conclusions but as well examined carefully all historical sources—throwing out the myths and fables and heroic tales that had gathered around the true thread of history.

It was Neibuhr who first began this work of freeing history from its mass of vagaries. Freeman yet further revolutionized the treatment of history. He pointed out that different races represent various stages of a common evolution. For example,

Japan has but recently passed through a stage of evolution that England had gone through a century ago. In other words, there is one great evolution, through which society as a whole is passing. Some races have gone on to higher stages, others have but reached a medium place yet. This gave rise to comparative history, and the tracing of the growth of institutions from nation to nation.

Up to the middle of the last century there was little or no philosophy of history and what there was, was more or less idealistic. Here we come to the broad dividing line between the position we are attempting to explain, the economic view of society, and the idealist's position. The idealistic position holds that ideas move society. A man may conceive a good thing and then persuade men to adopt it. In other words, as one writer has said, "Beautiful schemes may be thought out and then applied to society from without by propaganda." Hegel was one of the first to attempt a philosophy of history. He greatly influenced the thought of his time, and produced a revolution in philosophy by pointing out that all history is an evolution, not a collection of disconnected facts, as his predecessors had said. But Hegel's interpretation was, after all, idealistic. He clung to the belief that things develop themselves according to some "eternal idea." His great work really consisted in the discovery of a new method of thought and the principal thing that marked this method was the idea of process or development that ran through it. It was this method that once freed from its idealism laid the foundation for the economic view of society. It was this method that Hegel used when he stated that the history of society is the history of successive waves, and that Marx later employed when he described it as a series of class struggles.

Still another attempt of an idealistic character to explain the progress of society is known as the political interpretation of history. As pointed out by Prof. Seligmann, this holds substantially "that throughout all history there can be discerned a definite movement from monarchy to aristocracy, from aristocracy to democracy," and "a constant progress from absolutism to freedom." But "political change is not a primary, but a secondary phenomenon."

Finally, a third idealistic view of society has been held by those who have believed they saw in religion the keynote of social advance. As pointed out by numerous writers, religion is really a product and not a cause.

These three lines include practically all the important attempts to explain social growth from the idealist's standpoint. It was now possible for an interpretation of history to arise based on physical relations. Buckle's name is the one earliest connected

with the doctrine of physical environment. He explained that all psychical forces are conditioned by physical environment. He claimed that in early society the history of wealth depended entirely on climate and soil. He confined himself wholly to production, principally to the production of the food supply. He gave little attention to the problem of distribution and in fact confessed himself unable to deal with it.

The task that Buckle was unable to accomplish fell upon the shoulders of one well fitted to grapple with this intricate problem. Karl Marx was the originator of the idea of the economic interpretation of history. Buckle went no further than working out the effect of physical forces on production. Marx pointed out the fundamental character of economic changes in every phase of social life. His proposition was "that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch."

Marx had been profoundly influenced by the writings of Hegel, as had many another young German of that time. He recognized, however, what others did not, that Hegel's work consisted of two parts and that the idea of process running through his method was the valuable thing. Combining with this method his studies in natural science, he arrived at the theory that "all social institutions are the result of growth, and that the causes of this growth are to be sought not in any idea but in the conditions of material existence."

It is fairly well accepted that society as a whole may be compared to an organism. Its institutions, the superstructures, are determined in their form by the manner in which society produces and distributes its goods. An analogy between the social organism and that of a plant or animal may be drawn from the field of biology.

That the organs of animals are the result of conditions is shown by numerous examples. In countries where wolves are forced to feed mainly upon deer, the long, slim wolf has the best opportunity to survive, and in time the wolves in that locality become long-legged, slender animals.

At the same time nature economizes her resources, no material or energy is wasted in the struggle for existence. Everything is used in the most advantageous manner. In biology this is seen in the decay of certain organs when they grow useless, that are then said to have atrophied as well as in the growth or development of organs and faculties that have become necessary. The wings of the tame duck have atrophied or shriveled under domestication. Civilized man's senses of smell and hearing have grown

less acute than those of the savage, as they are called less into use. Exactly so, social institutions decay when the purpose for which they existed disappears and new institutions arise to meet new needs.

Prof Sumner of Yale says, "The notion that progress proceeds in the first instance from intellectual or moral stimulus, or that progress is really something in the world of thought and not of sense, has led to the most disappointing and abortive efforts to teach and elevate inferior races and neglected classes. The ancestors of the present civilized races did not win their civilization by any such path. They built it up through centuries of toil from a foundation of surplus material means, which they won through improvements in the industrial arts and in the economic organization."

Industrial life, the way in which men get their living is dominant, and as reasoning beings we must, no matter what ideals we may have cherished, deal with present facts and acknowledge the fundamental character of economic—of physical conditions. Throughout all the superstructures that have grown upon this foundation—governments, literature, ethics and education—there may be traced the predominating influence of the economic conditions of the time and place in which they were evolving.

For an illustration of this, let us turn to the field of ethics. It is well known that ethics is usually spoken of as a purely normative science, that is, one that outlines a certain system of laws for the governing of human action according to ideas of right and wrong. Within recent years there has grown up another side to ethical studies—the study of the actual relations of men in society at different periods and in different places and the tracing of the development of the idea of right and wrong. A large number of the economists have seen the relation that actually existing ethical systems in distinction from ideal systems bear to economic conditions. Marshall makes economic conditions among the most powerful in determining ethical relations. Patten likewise points out the economic foundations of morality. While Marx shows that as all other spheres of society arise from economics so ethics depend on the same cause.

Each great economic change has brought a corresponding change in codes of ethics. Men still in a state of savage warfare viewed certain acts as right. In the nomadic state virtues suited to the time appeared. With agricultural pursuits new changes arose, while industrial growth and modern capitalism have yet further modified the moral code.

Among warlike tribes any form of aggression was considered as one of the highest of virtues. At a certain stage of society, while tribes struggled with each other over their hunting and

fishing grounds, the very existence of the tribe depended on the boldness of its members. Fighting power, as Leslie Stephen points out, was the essential power of each race, hence we find a cultivation of the military virtues. The strong warrior was especially held in esteem by the Norse and ancient Gauls. Aggression in different forms continued throughout the period of savagery and into semi-civilized and civilized society until a new economic condition was introduced. Co-operation of some sort became necessary between men. They were forced together industrially and gradually aggression became a vice.

Again in European history we find constant accounts of the robberies committed by the Robber Barons. "At the opening of the 16th century public opinion not merely sanctioned open plunder by the wearer of spurs and by the possessor of a stronghold, but regarded it as his special prerogative, the exercise of which was honorable rather than disgraceful." Society offered no condemnation of these acts until economic change gave rise to the trading class. As this class grew in strength and social power public opinion began to look unfavorably on the nobles when they fell upon a train of merchandise. The trading class interests had now become powerful enough to dominate public opinion and open robbery finally became a vice.

One more example can be found in the old illustration from American history. So long as slavery in the North was profitable it was viewed as right, but when the long winters of the Northern States showed that hired labor was more economical, it became wrong. The industrial interests of the North caused the Civil War. It was fought for the purpose of making free labor cheaper than slave labor.

So we find that the economic conditions impress themselves on the literature, the government and the forms of education that exist in any period.

The supporter of the economic view of history is sometimes charged with laying his emphasis solely on the present environment. In fact, however, he takes into full consideration the other factors. At no time does he maintain that each stage of society begins *tabula rasa*. While he does lay particular stress on environment he fully recognizes the existence of heredity and that there are always the survivals of former stages that exert their influence upon the new conditions and institutions. In other words, we may say that the form and structure of the social organism is in a continual process of change and at any given time any portion of the organism—any institution or system of beliefs—is the product of a series of successive environments acting each in turn upon the product of the preceding environment.

Of first importance is the method by which social advance

has been made. The conflict of the ages has been between man and his environment. The question has been, how to gain control over the forces around him and turn them to his own and to the social good. "From the outset," as pointed out by Lester F. Ward, "there have been obstacles to the satisfaction of desire to remove which has required greater or less effort, and it is this effort that has resulted in change. In the animal world this effort (removal of obstacles) is mainly subjective. It transforms the organism, modifies organs, multiplies structures, and creates new varieties, species and classes. In man it does this too, but only to a limited extent. There the principal effects are modification of the environment to adapt it to the organs and faculties that he already possesses."

Primitive man faced the problem of providing himself with the barest wants of life—food, clothing, shelter. His slight knowledge, crude tools and material limited these to the scantiest amount possible and at the same time gave him little leisure from manual toil. Gradually as the rough stone tool gave place to the better bronze axe or the later iron implements, his wants multiplied and were better satisfied and at the same time leisure for some slight intellectual development was afforded.

Each improvement in technique and each new invention thus became the means of solving the problem of man vs. environment.

With the advent of civilized society and the breaking up of the old tribal organization, a series of classes appeared, each class that dominated society being brought to the front through some improvement in productive methods, and its existence depended upon the possession of certain things in society that other men, in order to live, were obliged to use—for example, the land was possessed by the nobles in feudal times, the land mines, factories and railroads by the capitalist to-day.

So, while man's productive power has so tremendously multiplied and he has bound the wind and water and made the fire and electricity obey him, we have the phenomenon of a large majority of the people still compelled to struggle with the bare problem that confronted the early savage—how to obtain food, clothing and shelter. At the same time the accumulated treasures of the intellect, of science, of art, have become to a large extent the possession of the few. All this is owing to the struggle of economic classes, the existence of which Marx was the first to point out.

The defender of the economic view of society is frequently charged with stirring up class antagonisms. To point out an existing fact, a truth, is never wrong. That classes exist few would deny. That the best way to remove them is by a candid recognition of their existence and the removal of their cause, seems self-evident.

May Wood Simons.

Meeting of National Committee.

THE meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party, which was held on the 29th, 30th and 31st of January, was in many ways of great importance and significance. Our space is too crowded to enable us to give full reports of the meeting, and, besides, we have commented upon the most important action at considerable length in the editorial department. The principal action was the removal of the local quorum because of its favorable attitude towards fusion, and the removal of the national headquarters to Omaha. A number of important resolutions defining the position of the party on various subjects and outlining tactics for further action were adopted. These resolutions are given herewith.

TRADES UNIONS.

The National Committee of the Socialist Party in annual session assembled, hereby reaffirms the attitude of the party toward the trade union movement as expressed in the resolution on the subject adopted by the Indianapolis convention of 1901.

We consider the trade union movement and the Socialist movement as inseparable parts of the general labor movement, produced by the same economic forces and tending towards the same goal, and we deem it the duty of each of the two movements to extend its hearty co-operation and support to the other in its special sphere of activity.

But we are also mindful of the fact that each of the two movements has its own special mission to perform in the struggle for the emancipation of labor, that it devolves upon the trade unions to conduct the economic struggles of the working class, that it devolves on the Socialist party to fight the political battles of the working class, and that the interests of labor as a whole will be best conserved by allowing each of the movements to manage the affairs within its own sphere of activity without active interference by the other.

The Socialist Party will continue to give its aid and assistance to the economic struggles of organized labor regardless of the affiliation of the trade unions engaged in the struggle, and will take no sides in any dissensions or strifes within the trade union movement. The party will also continue to solicit the sympathy and support of all trade organizations of labor without allowing itself to be made the ally of any one division of the trade union movement as against another.

We also declare that we deem it unwise to invite trade unions as such to be represented in the political conventions of our party.

LECTURE BUREAU.

That the National Secretary be instructed to proceed forthwith to the establishment of a lecture bureau. Such bureau shall consist of as many competent and efficient lecture members of the party in good standing as can be secured and utilized. The duty of such lectures shall be to expound the principles of Socialism, but not to discuss party affairs, policy or tactics.

The National Secretary shall arrange the lecture tours in conformity to the needs of the State and desires of the State organizations where such exist; the expense of the tour shall be divided between the States and locals and organizations affected as equitably as possible. The arrangements of the National Secretary shall require the approval of the local quorum and shall be subject to revision by the national committee in the same way as all other acts of the national secretary and local quorum.

The list of speakers shall be furnished to all organized States, together with mention as to the peculiar qualifications, terms, etc., of each speaker.

GERMAN ELECTIONS.

Whereas, Our comrades in Germany are at the present time engaged in a grand fight not only for the material interests of the proletariat in Germany, but also for the elementary human rights to political freedom against the oppression of a tyrannical autocrat; therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Committee of the Socialist Party in America, in common with the proletariat of the civilized world, hereby expresses its admiration for the magnificent stand and steadfast courage of our German comrades, together with an expression of confidence in their ultimate triumphs.

ANTI-FUSION.

Whereas, The history of the labor movement of the world has conclusively demonstrated that a Socialist Party is the only political organization able to adequately and consistently conduct the political struggles of the working class, and

Whereas, All "radical and reform" parties, including the so-called "Union Labor Parties" have, after a brief existence, uniformly succumbed to the influence of the old political parties and have proven disastrous to the ultimate end of the labor movement, and

Whereas, Any alliance direct, or indirect, with such parties, is dangerous to the political integrity and the very existence of the Socialist Party and the Socialist movement, and

Whereas, At the present stage of development of the Socialist movement of this country there is neither necessity nor excuse for such alliance; therefore, be it

Resolved, That no state or local organization, or member of the party shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise, with any political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations in order to further the interests of candidates of such parties or organization.

Any state or territorial organization taking any action in violating the anti-fusion resolutions adopted by this committee at St. Louis, January 31, 1903—or adopting a constitution or platform in conflict with the national constitution or national platform, and on the neglect or refusal of any such state or territorial organization to conform or to enforce such conformity on the part of any local or locals or members thereof under its jurisdiction shall be proceeded against in the following manner:

1. Charges may be made to the National Secretary by any member of the National Committee.

2. When such charges are so made, the National Secretary shall notify the State Committee and the National Committeeman from the state, furnishing a copy of charges.

3. The National Secretary shall thereupon obtain statements of the facts in the case from both sides within thirty days and forthwith submit the same to members of the National Committee.

4. On the majority vote of the members of the National Committee sustaining such charges such state shall cease to be an integral part or sub-division of the Socialist Party of America: all such decisions, however, shall be submitted to a referendum of the party membership, including the state in question.

Organized Labor and the Militia.

At the present time the question of the attitude of organized labor to the militia is not confined to America. Even in the most popular republic in the world, Switzerland, the antagonism which rose from the use of militia in internal dissension has found expression, and it is instructive for the laborers of this country to know something of what has happened there.

At the beginning of October a strike broke out in Genoa among the laborers on the street railways, which finally led to the whole of the organized laborers of the city laying down their arms and declaring a general strike.

The militia received orders to hold themselves in readiness to keep "order," notwithstanding the fact that that order had not been in the slightest degree in danger. This militia was largely made up of laborers. Five or six hundred proletarian militia, among which was Mr. Siep, the labor secretary of Genoa, refused to respond to the order of assemblage for the purpose of shooting and bayoneting their striking brothers.

The bourgeoisie of the Swiss demanded punishment for the laborers, who they claimed had in this way betrayed the Fatherland. Naturally the organized laborers took up the cause of the militia who had refused service. The convention of the Social Democratic party, which was held in Bassersdorf in the canton Zurich, on the motion of the representative from Genoa unanimously adopted the following resolution: "The party congress assembled in Bassersdorf expresses its deepest indignation at the recent events in Genoa. It denounces absolutely the attitude of the Government of Genoa that has surrendered the general welfare and security to the interests of capitalism, and has sought by provocative demands to arouse violence. We especially protest against the use of troops against the Swiss citizens and against the attempt to use Swiss soldiers against the so-called internal enemies. We will in the future more than ever maintain our hostility to militarism. The convention in conclusion expresses the opinion that it would have corresponded better to the dignity and well being of the country if the bundesrat had used its influence from the beginning to bring about a peaceable agreement instead of supplying more troops to the ruling class of Genoa."

Eight days later the Social Democratic convention, which had met for the nomination of candidates to the national legislative body, occupied itself especially with the brave attitude of the 600 proletarian militia and unanimously adopted the following resolution of sympathy with them:

"The Social Democratic assemblage of electors expresses their great admiration and sympathy for the Swiss soldiers who refused to recognize the call to put down the Genoa general strike. In the firmness with which they resisted the commands of the criminal law they may have the joyful consciousness that the laborers of Zurich, and indeed the whole Swiss laboring class, look upon them not as the accused, but as the accusers.

"The example which they have given may be imitated everywhere where a government attempts in the defense of the interests of capital to oppose the citizens in plain clothes to the citizen in military uniform with weapons in his hands. The assemblage adds to this declaration of sympathy an energetic protest against militarism and against class politics, which endeavors to use the Swiss militia against so-called internal enemies and against the organized labor class."

The adoption of this resolution naturally did not shield the laboring members of the militia from the legal results, especially since the Swiss laborers in the election which had taken place at Genoa in the meantime showed that the laborers were very indifferent to their own interests. The accused military in Genoa were brought before a military court, the accusation of refusing service was brought against twenty-seven of them, and all those accused were convicted, sentences of punishment varied from two days to four months in prison. The highest punishment was given to Herr Siep, the labor secretary, with whom, as well as the other accused, the privileges of a citizen were abolished for one year.

The events in Genoa and the resulting sentences of proletarian militia afford a picture of what could easily come to pass in the United States; perhaps there would be this difference, that American judges are by no means Swiss judges; very likely in such a case the accused laborers would be sentenced to four years rather than four months.

The appearance, during the events in Schenectady, where the painters' union of that place expelled one of its members because of his membership in the militia, and the prosecution which the bourgeois members inaugurated against this labor organization, shows us what is to be expected from the bourgeoisie and the judges in cases of strikes or other labor struggles, if proletarian soldiers should refuse to march against striking workers. The events at Genoa are in our opinion the best possible proof that the labor organizations are right when they oppose the military service of their members. But until the present time there has been no uniform opinion as to the proper attitude of the laboring class under such circumstances. While on the one side the view has been continually growing that the soldiers of the militia shall be kept out of the ranks of organized labor, on the other hand the

point of view has been offered that all laborers should join the militia regiments in order that the laboring class should have the majority of such regiments; in such a case it was thought that if it came to actual conflict the weapons which the proletarians would have received as members of the militia could be used against their enemies and in the defense of their own class.

This last view has at first appearance much attraction, what seems more evident than that it would be impossible to force the laborers to act against their own interests.

The events in Genoa show us, however, that this conclusion is a false one. The state from now on is by no means dependent upon the power of arms alone for its maintenance, it is the whole ruling social system that supports it. Laws, judiciary, government, legislation, possession, the whole social structure tied together with a thousand cords.

If a large number of militia soldiers refused to serve against the laborers, the state at once enters as executive. They would be punished as they were in Genoa and as we have seen in America under similar circumstances.

The phrase, "The militia must be democratized," has no meaning under present conditions. The American militia certainly could not be more democratized than is the Swiss militia. In Switzerland, every soldier (and every citizen capable of bearing arms must be a soldier), has his weapon at home so that he has complete control over it. In spite of this Genoa has shown that the democratization of the militia goes to pieces before the class antagonism and that laborers can be compelled to raise their weapons against their own class or else be sent to prison.

Certainly it can be said that with the entrance of the laboring class into practical politics and the increase of their political influence, their resolutions will change. This may be true, but only in a very restricted degree.

Suppose that the political labor party, and the Social Democracy was represented in a respectable minority in legislative bodies. Does any one actually believe that this would give the possibility of changing the fundamental legal forms in such a way that the militia could not be used in internal unrest? To ask such a question is to answer it in the negative, as long as there is a capitalist social system and so long as internal unrest are in the majority of cases identical with the unrest of laborers. There can be no legislation enacted contrary to the interests of the majority who are dependent upon the existing system. The militia has exclusively and expressly the single question of keeping "order" as it exists to-day, and the person who rules to-day, and the property of those persons. So long as the laboring class does not have political control, so long as laborers do not have a majority in the

legislative chamber, so long the antagonism between the laborers and the militia will remain and the laborers will be right in considering the militia as their enemies. To be sure, it will be wholly different when the labor class have conquered the political power in the state; then it may be necessary to put a weapon in the hand of every laborer, but at that time, however, the question of the militia can easily be pushed to one side by the importance of the other questions which will then come up for solution.

This article is translated from the St. Louis Arbeiter Zeitung, but the editor of that paper states that portions of it have appeared in the New York Volkszeitung and other German papers, and hence he does not claim credit.—A. M. Simon, translator.

Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid."*

ENRICO FERRI has pointed out in his work on "Socialism and Modern Science," how frequently the defenders of the present order have attempted to bolster up their position by arguments drawn from the field of evolutionary philosophy. They have mainly rested on the doctrine of the "struggle for survival." Kropotkin shows that there is an wholly other side to this question of no less importance. The principle of mutual aid or association for mutual protection and aggression is shown to be no less fundamental. It is pointed out that this fact was not overlooked by Darwin, but that his followers have laid all the emphasis upon the evolutionistic side of his doctrine.

Kropotkin shows how this principle runs through the whole biological world. He traces its foundations among the savages and barbarians in the cities of the Middle Ages and finally its manifestation in present society. He tells us that "Mutual aid is met with even amidst the lowest animals, and we must be prepared to learn some day from the students of microscopical pond-life, facts of unconscious mutual support, even from the life of micro-organisms." In locusts, beetles, land crabs and ants, he finds numerous instances of association for mutual assistance. But it is when he comes to the birds that the principle really begins to reach almost a dominating position. It enters throughout the whole life of birds, but in the time of migration even varying species gather. "All wait for their tardy congeners, and finally they start in a certain well-known direction—a fruit of accumulated collective experience—the strongest flying at the head of the band, and relieving one another in that difficult task. . . . Going now to mammals, the first thing which strikes us is the overwhelming numerical predominance of social species over those few carnivores which do not associate. "The cat tribe is offered as almost the only one which "decidedly prefer isolation to society, and are but seldom met with, even in small groups."

The last remnants of Malthusianism are swept aside, as he shows that practically nowhere in the world does animal life come anywhere near the limit of the resources available for subsistence.

"It is hardly necessary to say that those mammals which stand at the very top of the animal world, and most approach man by their structure and intelligence, are eminently sociable. . . . In the monkey and ape tribe from the smallest species to the biggest ones sociability is a rule to which we know but few exceptions." The intimate dependence of this associative principle upon the

*Mutual Aid a Factor of Evolution. By Peter Kropotkin. McClure, Phillips & Co. Cloth, 348 pp., \$2.00

evolution of the individual and the maintenance of life is continuously pointed out—"That life in societies is the most powerful weapon in the struggle for life, taken in its widest sense . . . could be illustrated by any amount of evidence. . . . Life in societies enables the feeblest insects, the feeblest birds, and the feeblest mammals to resist, or to protect themselves from, the most terrible birds and beasts of prey; it permits longevity; it enables the species to rear its progeny with the least waste of energy and to maintain its numbers albeit a very slow birth-rate; it enables the gregarious animals to migrate in search of new abodes. Therefore, while fully admitting that force, swiftness, protective colors, cunningness and endurance to hunger and cold, which are mentioned by Darwin and Wallace, are so many qualities making the individual, or the species, the fittest under certain circumstances, we maintain that under any circumstances sociability is the greatest advantage in the struggle for life. Those species which willingly or unwillingly abandon it are doomed to decay; while those animals which know best how to combine, have the greatest chances of survival and of further evolution, although they may be inferior to others in each of the faculties enumerated by Darwin and Wallace, save the intellectual faculty. The highest vertebrates, and especially mankind, are the best proof of this assertion. As to the intellectual faculty, while every Darwinist will agree with Darwin that it is the most powerful arm in the struggle for life, and the most powerful factor of further evolution, he also will insist that intelligence is an eminently social faculty. Language, imitation and accumulated experience are so many elements of growing intelligence of which the unsocial animal is deprived."

However, he does not by any means entirely overlook the importance of the idea of struggle: "No naturalist will doubt that the idea of a struggle for life carried on through organic nature is the greatest generalization of our century. Life is struggle; and in the struggle the fittest survive. But the answers to the questions "by which arms is this struggle chiefly carried on?" and "Who are the fittest in the struggle?" will widely differ according to the importance given to the two different aspects of the struggle; the direct one for food and safety among separate individuals, and the struggle which Darwin described as 'metaphorical'—the struggle, very often collective, against adverse circumstances."

"Don't compete! competition is always injurious to the species, and you have plenty of resources to avoid it! That is the tendency of nature, not always realized in full, but always present. That is the watchword which comes to us from the bush, the forest, the river, the ocean. 'Therefore combine—practice mutual aid.' That is the surest means for giving to each and to all the greatest

safety, the best guarantee of existence and progress, bodily, intellectual, and moral. That is what Nature teaches us; and that is what all those animals which have attained the highest position in their respective classes have done. That is also what man—the most primitive man—has been doing; and that is why man has reached the position upon which we now stand, as we shall see in the subsequent chapters devoted to mutual aid in human societies.”

He next proceeds to review man, and points out that “Darwin so well understood that isolately-living apes never could have developed into man-like beings, that he was inclined to consider man as descended from some comparatively weak but social species, like the chimpanzee, rather than from some stronger but unsocial species, like the gorilla.”

In his study of savagery he does not idealize but he does recognize that “the primitive man has one quality, elaborated and maintained by the very necessities of his hard struggle for life—he identifies his own existence with that of his tribe; and without that quality mankind never would have attained the level it has attained now.”

Even throughout barbarism this effect of mutual aid continued to develop and in the later stages of barbarism came together in the village community in which the principle of association began to be territorial rather than consanguineous: “The conception of a common territory, appropriated or protected by common efforts, was elaborated, and it took the place of the vanishing conceptions of common descent. The common goods gradually lost their character of ancestors and were endowed with a local territorial character. They became the gods or saints of a given locality; ‘the land’ was identified with its inhabitants. Territorial unions grew up instead of the consanguine unions of old, and this new organization evidently offered many advantages under the given circumstances. It recognized the independence of the family and even emphasized it, the village community disclaiming all rights of interference in what was going on within the family enclosure; it gave much more freedom to personal initiative; it was not hostile in principle to men of different descent, and it maintained at the same time the necessary cohesion of action and thought, while it was strong enough to oppose the dominative tendencies of the minorities of wizards, priests, and professional or distinguished warriors. Consequently it became the primary cell of future organization, and with many nations the village community has retained this character until now.” In this stage the idea of private property with its separative force has begun to appear, but by no means to become dominant.

He next takes up the associations of the Middle Ages. Here

he is on more familiar ground, as the Socialist writers have long pointed out the remarkable associative character of this historical stage. The mediaeval city, while having many points of difference, had a remarkably common type: "It was an attempt at organizing, on a much grander scale than in a village community, a close union for mutual aid and support, for consumption and production, and for social life altogether, without imposing upon men the fetters of the State, but giving full liberty of expression to the creative genius of each separate group of individuals in art, crafts, science, commerce, and political organization."

He grows enthusiastic over the work and labor conditions of the guild: "We are laughed at when we say that work must be pleasant, but—'every one must be pleased with his work,' a mediaeval Kuttentberg ordinance says, 'and no one shall, while doing nothing, appropriate for himself what others have produced by application and work.' And amidst all present talk about an eight hours' day, it may be well to remember an ordinance of Ferdinand the First relative to the Imperial coal mines, which settled the miner's day at eight hours, 'as it used to be of old,' and work on Saturday afternoon was prohibited. Longer hours were very rare, we are told by Janssen, while shorter hours were of common occurrence. In this country, in the fifteenth century, Rogers says, 'the workmen worked only forty-eight hours a week.' The Saturday half-holiday, too, which we consider as a modern conquest, was in reality an old mediaeval institution; it was bathing time for a great part of the community, while Wednesday afternoon was bathing time for the *Geselle*. And although school meals did not exist—probably because no children went hungry to school—a distribution of bath-money to the children whose parents found difficulty in providing it was habitual in several places. As to Labor Congresses they also were a regular feature of the Middle Ages. In some parts of Germany craftsmen of the same trade, belonging to different communes, used to come together every year to discuss questions relative to their trade, the years of apprenticeship, the wandering years, the wages, and so on; and in 1572 the Hanseatic towns formally recognized the right of the crafts to come together at periodical congresses, and to take any resolutions, so long as they were not contrary to the cities' rolls, relative to the quality of goods. Such Labor Congresses, partly international like the Hansa itself, are known to have been held by bakers, founders, smiths, tanners, sword-makers and cask-makers."

There were federations of the cities themselves for mutual action, as has been frequently pointed out. To those who still look upon mediaeval times as the "Dark Ages," the following quotation on the accomplishments of that age will come somewhat as a sur-

prise. "The results of that new move which mankind made in the mediaeval city were immense. At the beginning of the eleventh century the houses of Europe were small clusters of miserable huts, adorned with but low, clumsy churches, the builders of which hardly knew how to make an arch: the arts, mostly consisting of some weaving and forging, were in their infancy; learning was found in but few monasteries. Three hundred and fifty years later, the very face of Europe had been changed. The land was dotted with rich cities, surrounded by immense thick walls which were embellished by towers and gates, each of them a work of art in itself. The cathedrals, conceived in a grand style, and profusely decorated, lifted their bell-towers to the skies, displaying a purity of form and a boldness of imagination which we now vainly strive to attain. The crafts and arts had risen to a degree of perfection which we can hardly boast of having superseded in many directions, if the inventive skill of the worker and the superior finish of his work be appreciated higher than rapidity of fabrication. The navies of the free cities furrowed in all directions the Northern and the Southern Mediterranean; one effort more and they would cross the oceans. Over large tracts of land well being had taken the place of misery; learning had grown and spread. The methods of science had been elaborated; the basis of natural philosophy had been laid down; and the way had been paved for all the mechanical inventions of which our own times are so proud. Such were the magic changes accomplished in Europe in less than four hundred years. And the losses which Europe sustained through the loss of its free cities can only be understood when we compare the seventeenth century with the fourteenth or the thirteenth. The prosperity which formerly characterized Scotland, Germany, the plains of Italy, was gone. The roads had fallen into an abject state, the cities were depopulated, labor was brought into slavery, art had vanished, commerce itself was delaying."

When he comes to treat "Mutual Aid Amongst Ourselves," he is somewhat less satisfactory. Here his almost ridiculous "Statophobia" makes him look with horror upon association which is in any way connected with political forms. He seems utterly unable to see that the mediaeval city which he admired so much was a much more authoritative organization at many points than even the modern state, although to be sure in its most perfect form it approximated to the ideal of the future society upheld by Socialists, in that it was an administration of things. Kropotkin points this out when treating of the mediaeval city, but seems incapable of realizing that the present disorder is laying the form for a future association which shall be as much larger and better than that of the mediaeval city as the world market is larger than the city.

In his explanation of the causes of social evolution and the rise and fall of institutions, he is particularly weak. It is quite manifest that he is pursued by the ghost of economic determinism and fears lest he should yield to it in the least, so he accounts for the downfall of the mediaeval city by the fact that for two or three hundred years it was "taught from the pulpit, the university chair, and the judges' bench, that salvation must be sought for in a strongly-centralized state, placed under a semi-divine authority." Scientist though he is, it never appears to enter his head that this phenomena must have had a cause and did not arise from the "natural depravity" of its teachers. He has one rather striking illustration, however, in his discussion of "Mutual Aid Amongst Ourselves," which will be appreciated by every Socialist writer: "Every Socialist newspaper—and there are hundreds of them in Europe alone—has the same history of years of sacrifice without any hope of reward, and in the overwhelming majority of cases, even without any personal ambition.

"Every quire of a penny paper sold, every meeting, every hundred votes which are won at a Socialist election, represent an amount of energy and sacrifices of which no outsider has the faintest idea. And what is now done by Socialists has been done in every popular and advanced party, political and religious, in the past. All past progress has been promoted by like men and by a like devotion."

A. M. Simons.

The Historical Study of Sociology.

THE welfare of the individual is bound up in that of the community. It is true that the community is composed of individuals, and that its welfare is the sum of theirs. But it is no less true that the welfare of each individual depends on the corporate action of the community, whether in the sphere of sentiment, or in that of politics and law. Consequently the study of this corporate action and of the principles by which it may be directed so as to insure the largest happiness, is of all studies the most important to civilization and to mankind. To the people of a democratic country it is doubly important, because their future rests mainly in their own hands.

The subject of this study is marked out by its object. It deals with the action of groups, which, whether consisting of racial, political, or economic, aggregates, act together; and with that of classes composed of individuals, who, though acting each for himself, yet act under similar circumstances, from identical motives, and for parallel ends. The principles underlying their activity are the same which underlie the separate activity of individuals, but the elimination of special circumstances makes it possible to co-ordinate the former into a science. But it does not deal with activity of every kind. It has nothing, except indirectly and occasionally, to say about the progress of discovery in the physical sciences, about invention, about the extension of man's power over the world. It deals only with the psychic life—with conduct, whether proceeding from interested or disinterested motives, with the delimitation of conduct which ought to be enforced from that which ought to be left to discretion, and with the organizations, which have been formed in order to carry the purposes at which either class of conduct aims, and the enforcement of that which is to be enforced, into effect. It therefore amounts to a co-ordination of the social sciences—economics, ethics, juristics, and civics; though their boundaries, as ordinarily understood, may require some rectification to bring them within this grouping.

And this subject must be dealt with historically. Since the object is to guide the progress of civilization within the prescribed boundary, we must, unless we are to degenerate into Utopia-builders, ascertain how human nature has progressed, in order that we may detect the principles which underlie social change, and the course which it has hitherto taken, and, from the data so obtained, may forecast the course which it will take in future. The conviction that such a forecast is possible under-

lies the whole of this science. We cannot change the course which will ultimately be taken by civilization, nor need we desire to do so, for the course which will ultimately be taken is the best. What we can do is to make that course more rapid and less painful—to eliminate mistaken efforts by which, in the future, as in the past, amelioration may be sought by means not adapted to accomplish it; and to guard against the suffering which every advance in political or economic conditions has hitherto entailed upon large masses of mankind. It is this, that I mean by guidance. It is not a substitute for forecast, but is only possible in combination with it.

The possibility of forecast, and the fact that social change ultimately makes for betterment, depend on the same principle. The object of all human action except the rarest and most perverse, is the welfare either of self or others; and, though sometimes this object is sought by means which involve the suffering of an individual or of a group or class, yet that suffering is only an incident. Besides, when a group or class is the sufferer, its constant resistance leads in the end either to its extermination or absorption, or to its advance to a level with the oppressor, and the result, over long periods of time, is necessarily progress. The fact of this progress has been frequently noticed, but its cause has been so little understood that it has been thought necessary to refer it to the direct action of providences. Yet this progress has not been uninterrupted. There are nations which have remained for millenniums without perceptible advance; there have been instances of national decadence and of the overthrow of national independence, there have been checks and retrogression, and it is only when we survey mankind as a whole, or when we take the most restless races and extend our glance over considerable periods of their history, that we can see that the course has, on the whole, been upward. But, when we do this, we can see, not only an advance as a whole, but certain definite lines of advance, many of which the writer has catalogued, and of which an example may be found in the continual enlargement of the political unit, with the result, and often with the purpose, that ever-increasing areas are brought, as regards their mutual relations, within the domain of law.

It is by determining the cause of this advance, the means by which it has been and is accomplished, its course, and the resulting stages through which it has passed, that we can determine also the stages through which it will pass in the future, and so arrive at a conception of the true character of history. The cause we have already found in the desire for betterment. The interaction of human nature and its environment is the means. The action of man changes his ideals, institutions and laws, and

changes also the face of physical nature; this changed environment reacts upon human nature itself, those characteristics which are ill-adapted to it being subordinated or even atrophied, while those which are well-adapted are called into activity; the changed man makes another change in his environment; and the succession of these changes constitutes history. The course which this change has taken has been already glanced at. But the instrument by which it has been effected has hitherto been strife. There is not space here to enter at length into the question of the emotions and the will. But it is impossible to understand what follows without some explanation of the writer's views. He conceives that mental effort is normally self-determined, but that the soul is swayed by emotional and other impulses which play on it as the winds and waves play upon a ship, and which, difficult at all times to resist, sometimes attain such force as to deprive it of its freedom. That these impulses do not proceed from the man himself is plain from the fact that he often does resist them, and sometimes with success. They, therefore, must be referred, like many of the activities of physical nature, to a cosmic source, whatever the theory held respecting the nature of the cosmic source may be. Now some of these impulses prompt to aggression, and others to resistance; and it is the fact that human nature has been subjected to the aggressive and to the combative emotions which has made history what it is. If it had not been for these, human society would have crystallized at once into a communal form, or without assuming any definite structure, would have involved a generous communication of commodities and of good offices which would have been practically equivalent to it. Such a social condition would have afforded but little incentive to ingenuity. Progress in the arts and sciences, if it had existed at all, would have been very slow. Learning would have been at best an exercise of the intellectual powers or a means of gratifying curiosity, and would have been cultivated by few. There would have been no need of the elaborate machinery of government and of law. Customs would have been simple, inoffensive, and undefined. Substantially, there would have been no progress, nor would any need of progress have been felt. Life would have been one unbroken idyll—without care, without misery, but also without strenuousness and without knowledge. Rousseau's "state of nature" would have been realized. If, however, the aggressive impulses had been present without those that prompt to resistance, the weaker party would have been afraid, whenever the chances of success were against them, to risk the penalties which attend on unsuccessful revolt; and history would have been a record

of luxury on the one side, misery on the other, and debasement on both.

We owe progress then, and the need of progress, to the aggressive and combative emotions. Mankind, for purposes alike of aggression and defense, segregate themselves into groups, political, economic, and social, and the continual struggles between these make history. Strife is the condition of rapid and definite social change, whether retrogressive or progressive, but progress may in some degree result from a gradual process unaccompanied by it. The theory that "struggle" is the condition of progress involves a verbal awkwardness. "Struggle" is the effort of the attacked party to emancipate himself; and, when aggression has taken place, struggle is necessary in order to prevent retrogression. And without aggression, the wits would not have been sharpened, nor would intellectual progress or its economic results be great. But experience of the strife which aggression causes, and of the misery which results both from strife, directs intellectual effort toward their elimination. And, in time, society will attain, in combination with an intellectual power, a knowledge and a mastery over nature, which, but for the aggressive emotions it would not have possessed—that communal structure which, but for those emotions, it would have assumed from the first. For that result the whole course of the collective life of man has been and is a discipline.

History, if you take it in its full sweep, including the future as well as the past, presents all the characteristics of a tragedy. It is because the future has been assumed to be impenetrable that this fact has been veiled from us. If history be a tragedy that portion which is past must disclose some acts only—it cannot exhibit the issue. Nor does the history of a particular nation constitute a whole. Some nations, like some individuals, are cut off in their prime; and even if sometimes sin is followed by retribution, as when Roman aggression led to luxury, luxury to decadence, and decadence to subjugation; yet reformation, the highest element in tragedy, is wanting. But, in universal history, aggression leads to strife and both to suffering—the effort to obtain relief sharpens the intellectual powers, and leads to knowledge, invention and mastery over nature, and, above all, to improvements in the social structure itself, designed to restrict the sphere of the aggressive emotions—and forecast shows that this again will lead, in the yet dim, but not undiscernable, future, to their elimination.

If history be a tragedy, progress must have a finite goal. The human race may continue as long as this earth shall last; knowledge, too, may continue to increase, though freed from the spur which has goaded it hitherto, but the time must come when

the agonising struggle which has led so many into sin, so many into indifference, and so many into pessimism, will be over, and the political structure, and the ethical and economic life, shall have reached their final form—that form in which they will be best adapted to a humanity elevated to the highest level which is consistent with its finite limitations. This final form cannot be attained now—not merely because large masses of people cannot be persuaded to make a rapid and simultaneous advance, but also because human nature is not yet adapted to it. But if, as I have endeavored to show, human nature is capable of change; and if, as I believe, the change of which it is capable has a limit, it must produce and accommodate itself to the highest social structure and life which is compatible with it.

There are acts in the tragedy of history. Civilization has passed and will pass through definite stages, not, indeed, divided by fixed lines, but dominated each by a distinct principle, which dawns—rises to its zenith—and then declines while its successor is rising. The forces which cause each one of these can be discerned in its predecessor; and it is their regular succession which enables us, from observation of those that are past, to estimate those that are future. Writers on historic economics have seen this truth, and their suggestions as to the nature of these stages are valuable; but they have fallen short of the truth, because such writers have had to confine their view to one of the departments of social life, whereas, in each stage of progress, all these departments are co-ordinate, and are dominated by the same principle.

The succession of these stages of progress depends on the relative power of the different groups—racial, political, social, or economic—into which mankind have segregated themselves. Each of these groups is constantly fighting for the benefit of its own members, and against the other groups; and commonly there are two main groups so striving. Now, if the relative power of these groups is fixed, they are obliged to retain a fixed relation to each other. That relation may be one of equipoise—each group feeling itself unable, without too great risk, to aggress upon the other—it may be one of dominance—one group having another completely at its mercy; it may be intermediate between these—one group being in a position to dominate the other to a certain limited extent, and the other recognizing this and acquiescing; or it may be one of oscillation—each group dominating the other alternately. Finally, the groups may be merged into one group, whose members may have no interests antagonistic to each other. This last condition is the last act in the drama of history. Each of the earlier acts is constituted by the subsistence of one of the fixed relations; and, so long

as the groups stand in that fixed relation, their civilization remains in one of the stages or eras of progress. Such a relation may subsist for an indefinite period. It does not cease until the relative power of the groups is altered, and such an alteration is not a necessary result of the fixed relation, but is produced by some external cause, which, indeed, is very likely to happen at some time or other, but which need not happen within any particular period, however long. While the fixed relation subsists, the race or nation is unprogressive. When it is altered—strife—it may be military, it may be political, it may be economic—ensues between the groups until their relative strength has been ascertained, and then a new fixed relation emerges.

Each of these fixed relations is rendered possible by the grade of civilization which precedes it, and by the habits of thought and action which have been acquired in that grade of civilization. Hence they succeed one another in a regular order. If it were possible forcibly to establish any grade of civilization among a race not prepared for it, the people would not be able to accommodate themselves to it, and the attempt would fail. But of course, one race may be in a more advanced grade than another at any given time. The drama of history is acted by each race separately.

The eras of progress are five. I noticed this fact many years before I realized the tragic nature of history, but it is a remarkable coincidence that it corresponds with the number of acts in an Elizabethan drama. And, as the acts in a tragedy are subdivided into scenes, so are two of these eras also subdivided.

The first era is tribalism. This is subdivided into the period before and the period after the introduction of land-owning. That change does not make any sudden alteration in the habits of a tribe, but it sows the seeds of considerable further changes; and I think there is reason, from what we see in some parts of Africa, to believe that tribalism might have blossomed, though very slowly, into a more advanced civilization, without passing through a period of despotism. But all the most advanced races have passed through the second era—despotism—in which civilization has received impetus at the cost of great suffering. Despotism, in the sense in which the term is here used, means the dominance of one race by another. It generally takes the form of absolute monarchy, because the dominant race can assert its claims more effectively in that form than in any other, and because, as dominance originates in conquest, it is natural that the war chief, who is at first informally elected, should consolidate his power and make his dignity permanent and hereditary. But monarchy is not essential to it. Despotism succeeds tribalism because, in the constant warfare which is so marked

a feature in the life of savages, some one tribe finds itself more powerful than the rest. No doubt the superior military qualities of a leader often turn the scale, for prominent individuals are a factor in history, though their force has been over-rated. Be that as it may, despotism intensifies civilization, because, under its stern discipline, the subject race, or, as it later becomes, the subordinate class, is forced into habits of industry, while the dominant race is obliged to exercise its intellectual powers in the task of governing, and is at leisure to exercise them in other ways. But despotism, when it is administered wisely, even though only in the interests of the dominant class, confers one inestimable benefit on mankind—it necessitates a regular and defined system of law, however oppressive and one-sided that law may be. Under the reign of law the accumulation of wealth becomes possible, and a middle class rises to dispute with the dominant class for the possession of political power. The contest is slow, but wealth always triumphs in the end, and the great landed proprietors, though retaining their estates, lose all special privileges. But, in order to establish this condition it is necessary to lay down general principles respecting the right of all men to equality before the law, and these principles bear fruit in the emancipation of the lower class, whose outbreaks, in the earlier periods of history, has been always suppressed in blood. In time, the three classes accommodate themselves to their relative positions. As a general rule, though with some individual exceptions, a recognized standard of living prevails for each, and the members of each have incomes corresponding to it. Upon this understanding the three social classes, who had now settled down into the third era of progress—commercialism—might have remained in a condition of perpetual equilibrium, and civilization, having progressed into the highest condition compatible with individualism, might have rested as in a final form. Much happiness is compatible with this condition, and it does not imperatively call for further change. But its equilibrium was disturbed by the general substitution of nature-forces as industrial motors instead of the human hand. That change has produced a profound unrest in every department of life. It has from time to time rendered unnecessary the services of large bodies of workmen, and cast them on the market without providing for their instruction in any of the new callings which it has opened up. If this latter had been done no evil would have resulted, for it is an economic truth that there cannot be a general over-production of labor-power. But, as it was, great suffering and many deaths resulted from unemployment. As a remedy the rising generation of workers were better educated, and entrance into the learned professions was facilitated,

but the result has only been to overcrowd every department of intellectual life. Space would fail to describe the other economic difficulties which have arisen from this state of things—booms, depressions, strikes, “conspiracies” (so-called), oppressions and the most elaborately constructed frauds. Besides, the opportunities of employment have been mostly concentrated into cities, and population has necessarily followed them. But the attractions which cities present, and the necessity of making a good appearance before one’s neighbors, who, in cities, have one constantly in view, have increased the cost of living, especially among the working classes; and, though their remuneration has increased (which last can hardly be said of the professional classes as a whole), yet the standard of living has increased in a greater degree. This, combined with the frequent unemployment, and the unwillingness of women to live more cheaply after marriage than they have been accustomed to do before, has rendered marriage increasingly difficult and rare, and that again has increased unchastity, and indirectly has diminished the regard felt for the obligations of marriage when it is contracted. On the whole, the introduction of nature-motors into industry has brought in its train a seething unrest in every department of economic and social life, an unrest which will continue to irritate every fiber of the body politic until a remedy be found for it. That remedy must involve constant employment at a rate of remuneration sufficient for the maintenance of a family. But constant employment in a calling unalterably fixed cannot possibly be provided, because the amount of work in every calling is finite. Consequently, employment for the displaced can only be provided in other callings, and that can only be done by state action. And, as regards remuneration—once there was a time when, in each social class, the standard of living, the constancy of employment, and the rate of remuneration, corresponded. Now the incomes of different individuals in the same class, and in the same calling, and even of the same individual at different times, vary so enormously, and ups and downs of fortune are so frequent, that no rate can be fixed. In truth we have no social classes; but, instead, we have social coteries held together just so long as their incomes are approximately equal. Finally, the great employers of industry have the public increasingly in their grasp. The coal strike has strongly called public attention to this fact. I can see no remedy but State Socialism, with civil service rules, extended as the generations roll by, to every regular form of industry, whether manual or intellectual. No doubt political partisanship would have to be eliminated, and for that purpose an economic department of state, as free from outside control as the judicial department is now, would be re-

quired. But, after the institution of such a department, I can see no difficulty. Hence I have long believed that the fifth era of progress will be Socialism. To trace the slow future development from Socialism to Communism is unnecessary in an outline so short as this. I will conclude by saying that it is a mistake, in my judgment, to suppose that the life of early tribalism is communistic. This supposed fact has been given as a reason against the ultimate adoption of communal institutions, for, it is said, they would involve a return to an earlier stage of civilization. But, in truth, theft in early tribalism is punished very severely. The misconception was founded mainly on the fact that land, in early tribalism, is not owned individually, whence it was inferred that it must be owned collectively. But it is rights of sovereignty, not of ownership, which the tribe exercises over its roaming-ground. Land, at that period, is regarded as we regard air and sunlight—the ownership of it is not conceived as possible.

H. W. Boyd Mackay.

EDITORIAL

Observations on Present Party Affairs.

Last August we published an editorial entitled "Lines of Division in American Socialism," which attracted considerable attention and some hostile criticism. Every day since then has justified the positions there taken and fulfilled the predictions there set forth. The recent meeting of the National Executive Committee was particularly fruitful of illustrations of the truth of this editorial. We have seen the reports of several delegates and there was one point in which they were all remarkably agreed. All stated that there was no division on principles, but that when it came to details, discussion and disagreements were plentiful. This demonstrates the fact that the antagonism between the East and the West is one of temperament and of individual peculiarities and not one based on divergent economic interests. A very slight knowledge of American history would have shown that this suspicion and hostility regarding details is something that has existed throughout our history. Such knowledge would have prevented any such naive expression as was set forth by one delegate who seemed to think that it had arisen because "Some men in our party who should have known better have apparently made it their business to conjure up an antagonism between the West and the East." While there may have been some few comrades who had sought an opportunity to fish in these troubled waters, yet to account for the antagonism on such grounds is exactly analogous to the capitalist's explanation of the class struggle as being the result of the pernicious activity of troublesome agitators.

There is another explanation which exposes an ignorance, not alone of American history, but of Socialist philosophy as well, which is capable of very injurious results. There have been several statements to the effect that "The line is being drawn between agrarians and proletarians." Such a phrase is worse than an exposure of ignorance, it is absolutely pernicious. The word "agrarian" especially in the vocabulary of political Socialism is a direct importation from Continental Europe. It has brought along with it the meaning which attaches to it in that country, and in this sense it is simply ridiculous to apply it to the farmer movement of the great plains. The only great body of people in this country who are in any way comparable to the European agrarians are the farmers of the eastern and middle states, particularly of such states as Pennsylvania, New

York and Ohio. The farmers of these states, like those of Europe, are reactionary and obstructive of all progress. They will be found defenders of the high tariff as are those of Germany at the present moment, and in general their economic position and political ideas are similar to those who bear the name of agrarians in Europe.

Even the farmers of the eastern states have really little in common with the agrarian of Europe because of the fact that land ownership in this country has never carried any social distinction or any political power with it. There has never been a land owning, exploiting, farming class of sufficient size and coherency to constitute a political force in this country.

The farmers of the great plains are a wholly peculiar class much more comparable in economic position to the proletarians of the great cities than to the agrarians of Europe. When it comes to revolutionary attitude their actions are much more apt to be revolutionary than the wage workers, because of their hereditary character as the outcasts of capitalism. No proposal of compromise has ever yet come from the Locals of the Socialist party situated in this region.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that there is a strong trade union movement in this locality which is distinctly the most progressive and revolutionary in the United States, and this element undoubtedly constitutes the majority of the membership of the Socialist party in the western states.

The removal of the National headquarters to Omaha appears to us to be a mistake, but it was a natural reaction against the absurd and conceited sectionalism which for years had been preaching the doctrine that all wisdom was concentrated in a few of the great cities of the east.

An almost laughable illustration of the lack of knowledge existing in each section of the country concerning the other is seen in editorials which appeared simultaneously in the "New York Volkszeitung" and the "Appeal to Reason." The former declared that the only two cities which should be considered for National headquarters were New York and Chicago, and could see nothing of any revolutionary movement whatever in the neighborhood of Omaha. While the "Appeal to Reason" held that Omaha was "the center of the revolutionary section of the United States," and declared that this fact was so well known that "no argument need be adduced to prove this to a western man."

The reconciliation of these two contradictory positions is found in the different meaning which attaches to the words arising from different points of view. There is no doubt but that the real struggle with capitalism will center around the great industrial cities and the mining regions of the east and middle west. It is here that the great exploited proletariat is to be found, it is here that capitalism has reached its highest development and concentration has made industry ripe for socialization. On the other hand it is equally certain that the revolutionary elements even of this center have been largely driven west and are now to be found in the locality which "The Appeal to Reason" considers the revolutionary section. So it is that there is

at least a strong probability that the first electoral success will be gained in the Rocky Mountain and the Great Plain territories.

It is our personal opinion that while the geographical location of Omaha and its isolation from the industrial proletarian movement, which, in spite of the peculiar agricultural conditions in the United States, must always be the predominating and fundamental element in the Socialist movement, renders that city in many ways less desirable than some larger and more industrial cities, nevertheless this present change will be in many ways healthful. It will arouse new interest, bring new elements into the party, shake off a great deal of fossilized formalism, and in the end serve to make a better understanding throughout the party. It will be fatal, however, if the impression should go out that its removal to this city indicates any hostility on the part of the Socialist Party to the trade union movement, or even that it means a closer alliance with the A. L. U. than with the A. F. of L. For many reasons the Socialists will always feel more friendly to the economic organization which has adopted their political principles. But the fundamental fact that the trade union is organized primarily for fighting the class struggle in the economic field must not be overlooked. The corollary of this position is equally important that the Socialist Party is with the economic organization whatever its name and wherever it is fighting in the interests of the working class.

So far from there being any sign of hostility to trades unions from the western members it must be remembered that the rather extreme resolution requiring compulsory membership in trades unions of Socialist Party members was introduced by Comrade Mills, who is accused of being the leader of middle class sentiment. Right here again there is need of some intelligent understanding of the words which are used in Socialist economics. The words "middle class" have really little meaning in this country, as they originated in England, where society is classified into, first, a nobility, second large capitalists, and third small capitalists or middle class, and where the phrases "the upper and lower middle class" are parts of the ordinary vocabulary. If the words "middle class" has any meaning at all in America it is as applied to the small shop-keeper and small manufacturer, and to the retired farmer who lives by exploitation from rent. No more senseless use of the term could have been imagined than its application to the closely exploited farming class of the west. Just how the interest of these men will lead them to oppose any proletarian action, as is claimed by those who are antagonizing them has not yet been shown, and unless their interests do lead them to such action any arguments to show that they will adopt compromising tactics is a confession of lack of faith or lack of knowledge of Socialist principles.

We believe that the selection of Comrade Mailly for Secretary removes all possibility of misunderstanding in this direction. We are sure that no man could have been selected in whom a larger number of the Socialist Party would have such complete faith. His position as a trade unionist, his ability as a writer, and his tested skill as an organizer and director of a political movement fit him peculiarly for the position. In view of this fact we cannot but feel that the

referendum which is now being pushed forward to amend the constitution and remove the headquarters to Chicago is a rather hasty and perhaps ill-advised action. There is no question but that if the line of sectionalism can be forced that the proposed movement can be carried. The great bulk of the organized membership lies far east of the Mississippi river. This very fact should be a lesson to the western comrades of the need of organization by showing them their helplessness to enforce their influence in the party organization.

Another reason which will assist those who are seeking to remove the headquarters to Chicago is the unconstitutional and arbitrary action of the western comrades in moving the headquarters to Omaha and denying the referendum which is plainly provided for in the constitution. This was an inexcusable action notwithstanding that it could be paralleled a hundred times in the history of the United States by actions taken by the ancestors of the very men who did this. The rebellious pioneer has always had little respect for constitutions and little use for organization. He must, however, unlearn this hereditary characteristic if he is to work with his eastern ally for their common emancipation. Perhaps the greatest essential, next to education in Socialist philosophy, at the present time is a cohesive democratically controlled organization of the workers. On both the educational and organization side the western comrades are weak. This in itself would be no crime were it not for the assumed contempt with which they often treat these subjects.

It is another unfortunate feature of this controversy that as with so many other controversies there is a tendency to make it personal. The western comrades are already beginning to refer to Comrade Hilquit as being "tricky" and "schemy," while "The Socialist" of Seattle declares itself to have seen the "fine hand of Walter Thomas Mills" in the action. Those of us who are well acquainted with both of these comrades know that the allegation is equally uncalled for in either case. Both are shrewd men who know something of organizing the forces at their disposal and planning the lines of attack. To do this is no crime, and such language as that referred to is wholly uncalled for.

To talk of moving the headquarters as a rebuke to the unconstitutional action of the National Executive Committee is babyish, and this notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the N. E. C. represented but a small minority of the membership. The question of the locality of the headquarters should be determined independent of personal or sectional animosities. While as a permanent location Chicago has many advantages over Omaha, it is very certain that a headquarters which is perpetually en route is not conducive to the best work for Socialism, and since a national convention will meet in about a year it would seem to be an act of common sense to leave the headquarters in Omaha till then, and vote down the present referendum as a tendency simply to confuse and unsettle work.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Ever since the November election, when the Socialist party almost without warning piled up a quarter of a million votes, which was followed by a large vote in the New Orleans convention of the A. F. of L., also unexpected and surprising, the capitalists and their politicians have been in a condition bordering on panic, judging from the comments of their newspapers, the interviews of their spokesmen, and the circular letters that have been sent broadcast. The National Association of Manufacturers has taken the lead in attacking the unions, and especially the Socialists in them. Its president, Parry, made personal charges against the writer as being a "confiscator" and a "dangerous citizen," because he dared to advocate Socialism in the A. F. of L. without the aid or consent of capitalists. Mr. Parry was promptly challenged to debate in Indianapolis, Cleveland or any other place, but up to this minute has refused to accept, making the absurd excuse that union men would be debarred from attending the meeting because he is being boycotted. In New York a National Economic League was recently formed for the purpose of educating workingmen, especially trade unionists, upon the fallacies of Socialism from a "non-partisan" standpoint. The league is composed of bankers, lawyers and politicians, who can see no good in Socialism. The New York Socialists also challenged the officers of the league, but they have dodged a debate up to the present. "The International Golden Rule League" was formed about a month ago, and also for the purpose of solving the world's great problems and establishing "rightful relations" between employers and employes. Besides these organizations, the employers' federation, formed in Dayton, Ohio, about two years ago, is spreading through the State, and, in fact, the country at large, while the National Civic Federation is establishing local organizations, and other local bodies are springing up everywhere. All this goes to show that the rapid industrial and political organization of labor, the strikes, boycotts and ballots of the class-conscious workers have stirred up the animals. Nor is it wise to pay no heed to these capitalistic bodies. They are growing wonderfully and gaining great power. For example, the National Association of Manufacturers had but two hundred members a year ago, and to-day President Parry declares the membership is over two thousand. Its power has already been felt in Washington, where Parry boasts they killed the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills, and in several State Legislatures, where the hand of organized capital is seen in the defeat of labor bills. A person in a position to know

informs the writer that the capitalists are fully aroused to the peril that confronts their class. They understand that the people are awakening, on the other hand, to the ravages of the trusts and combines, and for that reason they will leave no stone unturned to keep labor subjugated. The capitalists are liberal with their money and intend to organize every city, town and hamlet in the nation if possible, and their speakers, newspapers and pamphlets will be utilized to the best advantage to stave off the political revolution that they dread. The prediction of Senator Hanna about a year ago, to the effect that the next great political struggle will be between the Republican party and Socialism, bids fair to be realized. Daily developments are becoming highly interesting.

During the past month some of the national unions have made attempts to get together on the jurisdiction question. The printers, pressmen, bookbinders, photo-engravers and stereotypers led off with a conference in Indianapolis and arranged an agreement which will be submitted to the members either in convention or through the referendum, and the outlook for harmony in the printing trade is particularly bright. The rival teamsters' unions will hold a convention this summer and amalgamate, according to the decision arrived at by the arbitration committee. The sheet metal works and the independent rival will also hold conventions in the same place and at the same time for the purpose of combining. The plumbers and the independent steamfitters held a conference, but were unable to come to an agreement, and the decision of the arbitrator was in favor of the former, which will mean that a demand will be made at the next A. F. of L. convention for the withdrawal of the steamfitters' charter. The painters were given jurisdiction over the glaziers and carriage painters by the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. at the recent session. The glaziers may yield and go into the painters' national union, but the carriage painters will not, as they are an important fraction of the carriage and wagon workers' union, and to abide by the decision might mean the dismemberment of the entire organization. The jurisdiction controversy between the brewers on the one side and the engineers and firemen on the other has been settled satisfactorily to the former. The brewers decided that the engineers and firemen in breweries may join the unions of their craft, provided that the A. F. of L. Executive Council or the next convention instructs other national unions that include engineers and firemen to turn those members over to their respective national unions. This action puts the jurisdiction proposition up to the powers that be in a manner that will show whether or not the brewers were singled out for attack by the "autonomists." Committees of the two national unions of carpenters are negotiating for a combination at this writing. Altogether the attempts to "get together" have been fairly successful, and unless new fights are started the Boston convention will be an improvement over the last one.

The labor press of the country is discussing with some interest the celebrated Taff Vale railway decision in England, where the unionists were mulcted out of \$140,000 damages for inaugurating a strike

and boycott, the courts holding that the organization is responsible for the acts of its members. There is considerable speculation as to whether the British decision will have any effect on future struggles between capital and labor in America. Apparently the Canadian employers are making an attempt to establish the English precedent in their soil, as the woodworkers of Berlin, Ont., have been sued for \$2,000 damages for boycotting. In Ohio also a case will be heard in Dayton in a few days, the metal polishers having been sued for \$25,000. There are similar cases pending in several other States, and, judging the future by the past, every effort will be made by the capitalists to confiscate the treasuries of the unions, and thus weaken them. The unions have been growing too rapidly to please the bosses.

The Brotherhood of Railway Employees, which includes all classes of workers, from track laborer to engineer, and which is reported to have experienced great growth in the extreme West, has voted to join the American Labor Union. The brotherhood has just won its first important strike, on the Canadian Northern railway, and is said to have 40,000 members. The A. L. U. is also cutting into the East, having secured several unions of engineers, bakery workers, etc., in New York City and a number of locals in Massachusetts. The flint glassworkers, who recently withdrew from the A. F. of L., may vote on the proposition of joining the A. L. U., the Philadelphia unions having petitioned for a referendum on the question, and it is said there are nearly eight thousand unionists in the latter city who are likely to join the new organization. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers also contemplates taking a referendum vote on the proposition of affiliating with the A. L. U. So far none of the local unions in the West which are under the jurisdiction of nationals and also affiliated with the A. L. U. have obeyed the summons to withdraw where made. In several instances the locals have openly defied the national officers, and in other cases the national unions are perfectly satisfied to have the locals retain their affiliation.

W. R. Hearst, the newspaper publisher, is making a scramble for the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket. His head has been turned by his election to Congress from one of the submerged districts in New York, where votes are purchased in large blocks for next to nothing. The sudden rise in Union Labor parties on the Pacific coast and in Connecticut towns has given him the cue to agitate for a sort of fusion between the Laborites and the Democratic party, as well as various scattered Populistic and reform elements. Hearst also poses as "something of a Socialist," and in his wild endeavor to rattle around in the presidential chair he is not above practicing his familiar art of dissembling, and his organs quote Debs as saying that he would undoubtedly be the Democratic nominee and would secure the support of the Western unionists, who have declared for the Socialist party. Of course, Debs said no such thing, but similar statements will be made by the Hearst papers from now on. Hearst has already established a literature bureau, and his agents are soliciting the names and addresses of unions all over the country, and the organizations are being flooded with pamphlets and leaflets

recounting all the nice things that have been said about Hearst and what "he has done for labor," which literature finds its way into waste baskets as fast as received. If Mr. Hearst expends material support from the Union Labor party he is liable to be disappointed, because these parties are having their own troubles. The U. L. P. in San Francisco is in the throes of dissolution for the reason that Mayor Seaman has appointed Republican machine politicians to nearly all the offices and spoiled the volunteers, and the same report comes from Hartford, Conn. The Populist movement is gone where the wooden-ironists and the Socialist party is a unit against any and all fusion deals.

Probably it will please American trades unionists to learn that Ben Tilley, the famous British orator, will make a lecture tour in this country beginning about the middle of October. Tilley has no peer as a public speaker, and the latest report from England has it that he is likely to be elected a member of Parliament by the combined Socialist and trade union voters in a strongly organized district.

It is reported that an attempt will be made in Canada to organize a workers' movement. Not only are local unions to be withdrawn from the A. F. of L. but from the international organizations as well. The scheme has probably emanated under the haze of certain gentlemen who are anxious to become great leaders. The claims they make are that too much money comes across the border, and that whenever strikes are on in Canada officers from the States are sent over as direct affairs, and that they are unacquainted with local conditions and do not have the confidence of the public. The labor movement in Canada has taken phenomenal strides during the past three or four years. Previous to 1900 there were few unions in the Dominion, and it is doubtful if the total membership would foot up 15,000 at that time. To-day Canada can boast 1,100 unions, and the membership will aggregate 100,000. And a good many American dollars were spent to accomplish this work.

A so-called "organization" known as the National League of Independent Workmen of America is being formed in the East by non-union men, with the aid and consent of the employers. It is a shrewd scheme to disrupt union labor by posing as a labor organization. A promoter of the plan, Rev. R. F. Fairchild, of Albany, N. Y., in speaking of the proposed league, says: "The league is being organized. It is proposed to get a national organizer in the field and organize local branches all over the country, and demand that employers run their shops as 'open shops' in which union and league men can have an equal chance of employment. The league will be strictly a laboring men's affair, but it will be incorporated so as to command the confidence of employers and the general public, and be in a position to defend the rights of its members through the courts. Only American citizens will be eligible to membership."

The tobacco trust is working a shrewd game that may not be generally known. During the past few months there has been quite an agitation started by small tobacco manufacturers and retail deal-

ers in different parts of the country, with the result that local organizations have been perfected which are to be merged into a national body—a sort of trust to oppose the big combine. But now the story comes from New York that some of the so-called independents are really owned and controlled by the octopus and they are lined up with the opposition for the purpose of keeping advised of every move that is being made against the big trust. This is the policy that was largely carried out by the Standard Oil monopoly and its success is well known.

The brewery workers have just closed a most successful special convention in Cincinnati. Despite the desperate fights that the union was in with the bosses in Boston, Cincinnati and other places during the past year, as well as the attacks that were made by other organizations in jurisdiction controversies, the brewers are more firmly united than ever. They have fully eighty per cent of the trade organized, and the heavy drain on their resources has developed such splendid discipline and loyalty that the union's credit is good for a large amount in the war chest. The brewers reaffirmed their allegiance to the principles of Socialism, and by almost unanimous vote the members were advised to extend their financial and moral support to the Socialist party.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Daughter of the Snows, by Jack London. J. B. Lippincott Company. Cloth 334 pp. \$1.50.

First and foremost this is a story—a story of the territory which Jack London has marked out in fiction as his own—the Klondike. It is not written to teach social economics, but it would be impossible for as thorough a Socialist as Jack London to write such a book as this and not have his attitude on social subjects show through. Frona Welse is a sort of Norse goddess who moves through the story somewhat as her ancient prototypes moved through the sagas of the Northmen. But this modern Brunnhilde has been to Paris and to Boston, reads Browning and quotes Whitman. Nevertheless she has lost none of her primeval characteristics. She is the incarnation of the gospel of the strong and her religion is the religion of the trail whose strongest test is being true to “bed and blanket.” She comes through the trail and through the Dyea Pass in the midst of a storm and with a series of most unconventional adventures. Her father “was a giant trader in a country without commerce, a ripened product of the nineteenth century, flourishing in a society as primitive as that of the Mediterranean vassals. A captain of industry and a splendid monopolist, he dominated the most independent aggregate of men ever drawn together from the ends of the earth. An economic missionary, a commercial St. Paul, he preached the doctrines of expediency and force. Believing in the natural rights of man, a child himself of democracy, he bent all men to his absolutism. Government of Jacob Welse, for Jacob Welse and the people, by Jacob Welse was his unwritten gospel. Single-handed he had carved out his dominion till he gripped the domain of a dozen Roman provinces. At his ukase the population ebbed and flowed over a hundred thousand miles of territory, and cities sprang up or disappeared at his bidding. . . . Men drifted into the land. Hitherto famine had driven them out, but Jacob Welse was there now, and his grub-stores; so they wintered in the frost and groped in the frozen muck for gold. He encouraged them, grub-staked them, carried them on the backs of the company. His steamers dragged them up the Koyukuk in the old days of Arctic City. Wherever pay was struck he built a warehouse and a store. The town followed. He explored; he speculated; he developed. Tireless, indomitable, with the steel-glitter in his dark eyes, he was everywhere at once, doing all things. In the opening up of a new river he was in the van; and at the tail-end also, hurrying forward the grub. On the outside he fought trade combinations; made alliances with the

corporations of the earth, and forced discriminating tariffs from the great carriers. On the inside he sold flour, and blankets, and tobacco; built sawmills, staked town sites, and sought properties in copper, iron and coal; and that the miners should be well equipped, ransacked the lands of the Arctic, even as far as Siberia for native-made snowshoes, mukluks and parkas.

He bore the country on his shoulders; saw to its needs; did its work. Every ounce of its dust passed through his hands; every postcard and letter of credit. He did its banking and exchange; carried and distributed its mails. He frowned upon competition; frightened our predatory capital; bluffed militant syndicates, and when they would not, backed his bluff and broke them. And for all, yet found time and place to remember his motherless girl, and to love her, and to fit her for the position he had made."

The heroine is a true daughter of her father, and we feel instinctively when the contest begins for her favor between the smooth, superficial Gregory St. Vincent and the cool, hardy engineer, Vance Corliss, that the palm is to go to the latter. The final test comes when St. Vincent breaks the "faith of bed and blanket" and permits a man to be murdered whose cabin he was sharing without coming to his defense.

There is something almost Zola-like in the strength of the story but it has none of Zola's diffusiveness and none of Zola's mannerisms. There are some striking descriptions of the free and easy life where man comes close to nature, some revelations of the strong character that may yet lie beneath those whom the world has socially seen fit to despise. But these points have been brought out before.

In *Frona Welse*, however, has been given a new character to fiction; she reveals characteristics that have been unknown to literature since the days of the sagas. Besides the few suggestive thoughts that are contained in the quotation already given, we find running through the book a philosophy of the strong which trenches on Nietzscheism. Sometimes this philosophy gives way before the Socialist thought that is in his mind as where he says: "These be the ways of men, each as the sun shines upon him and the seed blows against him, according to his kind, and the seed of his father, and the milk of his mother. Each is the resultant of many forces which go to make a pressure mightier than he, and which moulds him in the predestined shape. But, with sound legs under him, he may run away and meet with a new pressure. He may continue running, each new pressure prodding him as he goes, until he dies, and his final form will be that predestined of the many pressures. An exchange of cradle—babes, and the base-born slave may wear the purple imperially, and the royal infant beg an alms as wheedlingly or cringe to the last as abjectly as his meanest subject. A Chesterfield, with an empty belly, chancing upon good fare, will gorge as faintly as the swine in the next sty. And an Epicurus in the dirt-plot of the Eskimos will wax eloquent over the whale oil and walrus blubber, or die.

"Thus in the young Northland, frosty and grim and menacing, men stripped off the sloth of the south and gave battle greatly. And they stripped likewise much of the veneer of civilization—all of its follies

most of its foibles, and perhaps a few of its virtues. May be so; but they preserved the great traditions and at least lived frankly, laughed honestly, and looked one another in the eyes."

But on the whole, as was said at the beginning, the story does not attempt to preach, but is simply a splendid story which brings one out of the conventionalities and commonplaces of our present society and lifts and exhilarates like a breath of fresh air to one coming from a crowded, overheated drawing room.

The Economic Interpretation of History. By Edwin R. A. Seligman. Macmillan Company. Cloth. 166 pp. \$1.50.

The Socialist reader of this book is forced to admit at once that it is one of the best presentations of one of the fundamental principles of Socialism that has ever been written and is in some ways far superior to anything that the English-speaking Socialists have themselves written on this subject. The thesis of *Economic Interpretation of History* is thus stated: "The existence of man depends upon his ability to sustain himself; the economic life is therefore the fundamental condition of all life." There have been various attempts at giving a unified interpretation of history. The first and most simple and most useless of these was the "great man theory." The second maintained that religion is the keynote of progress. The third explanation "might be called the political interpretation of history. It holds substantially that throughout all history there can be discerned a movement from monarchy to aristocracy, from aristocracy to democracy, and that there is a constant progress from absolutism to freedom, both in idea and in institution."

He then traces the origin of the theory of economic interpretation from Montesquieu, Buckle and others to Marx, whom he always concedes is entitled to credit for developing the theory. He considers the contributions the theory of Feuerbach, Lassalle and Rodbertus, but decided that "... if originality can properly be claimed only for those thinkers who not alone formulate a doctrine, but first recognize its importance and its implications, so that it thereby becomes a constituent element in their whole scientific system, then there is no question that Marx must be recognized as in the truest sense the originator of the economic interpretation of history. . . . Whether or no we agree with Marx's analysis of industrial society, and without attempting as yet to pass judgment upon the validity of his philosophical doctrine, it is safe to say that no one can study Marx as he deserves to be studied—and, let us add, as he has hitherto not been studied in England or America—without recognizing the fact that perhaps with the exception of Ricardo, there has been no more original, no more powerful, and no more acute intellect in the entire history of economic science."

Engels further developed the theory, but since then it has received little important addition save in ever wider and wider applications. When it comes to criticism of the theory we cannot agree with some of the bourgeois critics of this book that Professor Seligman is particularly successful. At the very beginning he adopts a sort of smart and patronizing air, and after accusing the Socialists of being too free

with their generalizations, he proceeds to declare that "some of his (Marx) statements are erroneous and not a few of his historical explanations are far-fetched and exaggerated." One would think that such a wholesale statement as this would require a little proof or at least an example or two, but nothing of the kind is offered.

The chapter on "Historical Law and Socialism" is decidedly weak. He seems to think he is arguing whenever he makes an assertion; for example he makes the following statement as if he was really hitting something, or somebody. "To suppose that private property and private initiative, which are the very secrets of the whole modern movement, will at once give way to the collective ownership which forms the ideal of the Socialists, is to shut one's eyes to the significances of actual facts and to the teachings of history itself. Rodbertus was at least more logical than Marx when he asserted that the triumph of Socialism would be a matter of the dim future." But the fact is that neither Marx nor any other Socialist writer of any prominence ever maintained such a catastropheic theory as that which he here imputes to them. It is significant that almost no mention whatever is made of the one great document in which the economic interpretation of history is set forth in its clearest and most complete manner, the Communistic Manifesto. There is a note containing a portion only of the famous quotation in which the whole theory is summarized, and here he breaks off at the point beginning "and consequently the whole history." It is hard to believe that this was done unconsciously. Professor Seligman is too much of a scholar not to know that the rest of this sentence would have overthrown practically his entire argument by showing the intimate connection between the class struggle and economic determinism. Intellectual sense and fairness would have demanded the printing of this entire, or else the omission of all reference to Socialism.

It would be the easiest kind of work to make mince meat of his last two chapters. There are several other bad breaks as to facts in the book, as for example where Belfort Bax is classified among those who accept the economic interpretation of history and where Massaryk is quoted as a Socialist. On the other hand the elaborate notices and references constitute one of the best bibliographies which have ever been gathered in English, although even here it would have been possible to check his work on some points from the elaborate German bibliographies which exist.

Constructive and Preventive Philanthropy. By Joseph Lee. Macmillan Company. Cloth. 242 pp. \$1.00.

This book is the story of what has been accomplished in trying to heal the abuses of capitalism while leaving the thing itself untouched, and its name is about as much of a misnomer as possible. Indeed, the very terms are contradictory, and is as if one should speak of preventive therapeutics. Philanthropy presupposes that the social body is sick and you cannot speak of preventive treatment of the sick against disease. It is the well who must be treated preventively. Notwithstanding this misleading title the book contains much that is of value to the social student. Indeed, it is by far the best treatment yet offered

on the efforts which are now being made to improve conditions without touching fundamental causes. In many directions these workers have been brought in touch with problems which demand revolution in order to produce effective results, and in so doing their work offers suggestions of what can and will be done when social conditions are so altered as to make possible the things for which they are striving. This is especially true of the departments on "Vacation Schools," "Playgrounds for Small Children," "Baths and Gymnasiums," and "Industrial Training." In none of these fields, however, does the author seem to be aware of the fact that the Socialists are the only ones who have taken hold of these subjects from the foundation and are accomplishing more in many countries than all the boards, charity societies and organizations of which he has so much to say. The portion of the book dealing with the housing problem and the struggle with disease is simply a story of a struggle with a system of exploitation. Here again he has never heard of the work of the Belgian and Danish Socialists who have carried out most of the things at which he is aiming or have developed the ideas which he discusses much further than any of the authorities given by him. Yet until the work of the European Socialists are translated into English this work will be found of value to Socialists who may be interested in municipal betterment. As such it is well worth the study of the numerous newly elected Socialist municipal officers. Indeed, it is safe to say that the only chance there will ever be of any really effective work along the lines here sketched out will come through the election of Socialists who will not be restrained by fear of injuring property interests. But when this is done it will not be called philanthropy, but justice.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Darrow's "Resist Not Evil."

No recent sociological work by an American writer has excited more comment and discussion than "Resist Not Evil," by Clarence S. Darrow. Mr. Darrow has something to say, he is not afraid to say it, and he writes delightful English, making it a pleasure to read anything from his pen. The impression made by his book upon the conventional defender of capitalism is well shown in the following extract from the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

"This is a startling arraignment of the doctrine of force and punishment, the attitude taken by the author being that of a rank Socialist. The same old theme is in evidence; that certain men calling themselves rulers, having forcibly seized the earth and desiring to keep possession of its treasures forever, have made certain rules and regulations to this end, and when the so-called disinherited have reached out to obtain the means of life, they have been met with these arbitrary measures and lodged in jail. . . . The book begins with an attack on the nature of the state, then taking up armies and navies in the same spirit scores their very existence as a power for evil, and treats all forms of civil government with like condemnation. But the portion which deals with crime and punishment occupies the greater part of the volume, and is a rabid assault on every known agency for the protection of law and order and the enforcement of discipline. . . . The closing chapter, on the right treatment of violence, is drawn on the regulation 'how to make everybody happy' lines usually adopted by the Socialist in his dreams of a perfect world, where laziness, incompetency and degeneracy will share alike with honest labor and brains. The keynote of the volume lies in extreme exaggeration of existing conditions, and visionary theories for their betterment."

Other newspaper men, who apparently are more free to express their own opinions, comment as follows:

Hartford Times: "Mr. Darrow has made an extremely ingenious and interesting book in defense of the doctrine he has taken for his title. That much must be granted by those who dissent most positively from his teaching, which is in substance a sublimated anarchy—not in the least the kind that throws bombs and wars on society, but that which holds courts and laws unnecessary."

Paul Thieman, in Denver Post: "I must say frankly that I be-

lieve the doctrine of non-resistance is just as impossible as the exploded doctrine of black slavery, but I admire Darrow's book for its simplicity of style, and I believe that it will come very close to being a classic. Darrow says he got it all from Tolstoi, but if the little book is great the credit should all be Darrow's. . . . But I can't help not suppressing the amusement I always feel over the Anglo-Saxon who seriously espouses the Oriental theory of non-resistance. In spite of himself he is pugnacious and warlike. One can't get over the impression that Mr. Darrow would fight with the utmost determination to uphold his belief."

Buffalo Courier: "The book is logical, if not practical, and there is much in it to set one thinking."

"Indianapolis Sentinel: "Although we do not fully agree in his conclusion, Mr. Darrow has evolved a theory with much plausibility, and his book should be read by every candid student of social and economic problems. He makes an extreme statement, but there is much truth and some justice in what he states. As a lawyer, fighting what he conceives to be the battle of the weak against the strong, Mr. Darrow is a living contradiction to his own doctrine of 'Resist Not Evil,' but this inconsistency need not be charged as militating against his sincerity. A man may know and value ideals while not able to practice them. And the reader of Mr. Darrow's book should not conceive him to be a hypocrite or a dreamer, but accept him as being honest and sincere, however different his views are from the orthodox treatment of the subject."

St. Paul Dispatch: "However one may disagree with him, a positive enjoyment is possible from the study of the subject, with Mr. Darrow's aid."

Pittsburg Chronicle-Telegraph: "The author displays an earnestness of style and originality of treatment that gives his work enhanced value."

Minneapolis Times: "It is, first of all, a volume very simple in its line of argument, and as clear as crystal in its style. Whether you believe or not in Mr. Darrow's theory, you will like his method of unfolding it. . . . The possibilities of human nature are always beyond its probabilities on the side of improvement, which is a reason why the disbelievers of the 'Resist Not Evil' idea should be slow in criticism, and really enjoy this little book, whose ideas have been the favorite ones of the greatest reformers of the world, but have never, it is safe to say, been more fully expanded in such simple and transparent English."

To conclude, we will quote from one Socialist review, that of the Toiler, Terre Haute, Ind.: "In his exposition of government and all its auxiliary agencies, including the military and judicial functions, the author stands squarely on the Socialist position which proclaims them to be instruments which derive their source from the capitalist system and are used to keep in subjection the working class and to preserve class rule. His criticism of criminal law and the failure of its application to secure the results sought is a splendid contribution to the literature of revolt and will be read with pleasure by those who procure the book. One is at a loss to understand how one with such

a keen perception of the basis of capitalism as Darrow possesses can stay in the mire of capitalist politics."

"Resist Not Evil" is a beautifully printed volume of 179 pages, daintily bound in extra silk cloth with white stamping, and the price, including postage to any address, is 75 cents, to our stockholders 45 cents.

Sombart's "Socialism and the Social Movement."

This book has already been mentioned in these pages, but its great importance justifies us in giving it additional space at this time. It is a work which is really indispensable to any Socialist who intends to try to explain Socialism to others, either with voice or pen. It is not in itself a propaganda work, but rather a scientific examination of the working class movement by one standing apart from it. Nevertheless it is one of the clearest expositions of scientific Socialism ever written. The best informed Socialist will find that it will aid him in formulating his ideas in a way to carry conviction to others, while the average Socialist who has read little beside newspapers will find his ideas wonderfully broadened and cleared by a careful study of this book.

There are eight chapters, entitled as follows: "Whence and Whither," "Concerning Utopian Socialism," "The Antecedents of the Social Movement," "The Development of National Peculiarities," "Karl Marx," "The Trend Toward Unity," "Tendencies of the Present," "Lessons." There is also an appendix showing a chronicle of the social movement from the year 1750, in four parallel columns, one giving events in France, one in Germany, one in England, and one in the international organization.

The book contains 216 large and beautifully printed pages and is bound in extra vellum cloth, with gold stamping. The price is one dollar, with the usual discount to stockholders. We will mail a copy free to any one sending us the name of a new subscriber to The International Socialist Review for one year with one dollar. If you wish the book at once, and will undertake to find a subscriber later, send one dollar and we will send you the book, and will also, if requested, inclose a subscription post card good for The Review one year to a new name.

The Communist Manifesto.

One might be a certain sort of a Christian without having read the Sermon on the Mount, but the chances are against such a Christian having a very clear idea of what his religion means. It is also true that one might be a certain sort of a Socialist without having read the Communist Manifesto, but the chances are considerably more than even against his having an adequate conception of what Socialism means. Not that Socialism rests on the authority of the Communist Manifesto or any other book. Merely that the principles of Socialism were first stated in the Communist Manifesto, and so admirably stated that this has for more than fifty years been recognized as the best brief exposition of Socialism. To try to understand Socialism without studying the "Manifesto" is an absurd waste of energy. The book contains only sixty-four pages, but its importance and influ-

ence are not measured by its bulk. It has heretofore been published only in extremely unattractive editions, but it is now offered by our co-operative publishing company in a dainty pocket edition, with flexible cover, stamped in gold, at ten cents, and in a substantial library edition, printed on heavy paper with wide margins, and bound in silk cloth, for fifty cents. Either edition will be mailed on receipt of price, with the usual discounts to stockholders in our co-operative company.

The Republic of Plato.

The third book of this world-classic is now offered to American readers in a daintily printed edition, uniform in style, with the first and second books previously published. The translator is Alexander Kerr, professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin. His work on the first two books has been enthusiastically commended by scholars, since he has taken the utmost pains not only to reproduce the thought of the original with absolute fidelity, but to do this in clear and strong English, easy of comprehension by those who are not Greek students.

Plato's Republic is the earliest and also the ablest of the countless attempts to formulate an ideal scheme for reconstructing society. Written 2300 years ago, it is still far in advance of most that passes for philosophic discussion of ethics and statecraft. Moreover, it is one of the greatest examples of the Socratic form of argument, and is thus indispensable to any student desiring to reach a broad comprehension of the philosophic basis of Socialism. The first book is mainly taken up with a discussion of the nature of justice, and it may be a surprise to some readers to know that in this product of the fourth century before the Christian era there is a clear recognition of the truth that in a state founded on slavery, like that of Athens then or America to-day, "justice" means action in conformity with the interest of the strongest, the rulers.

It should not be inferred, however, that the "Republic" is in any sense a Socialist work. Not only is it true that there was no possible foundation for scientific Socialism before the invention of modern machinery; it is also true that Plato was distinctly an aristocrat, and was squarely opposed to allowing the workers any share in the government. But after all allowance has been made for this, it should still be remembered that Plato's "Republic" is a work of genius of the highest order, one of the world's greatest books, and one which until now has been the exclusive property of the leisure class.

The second and third books are mainly taken up with a discussion of the system of public education to be followed in the ideal state. Each book is in a sense complete in itself, yet there is a close logical connection between the three. They are published in uniform style at 15 cents each, with the usual discounts to stockholders in our co-operative company.

CHARLES H. KERR & CO., Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.